

THE
Lutheran
Quarterly



Volume XII

MAY, 1960

Number 2

THE LUTHERAN
LIBRARY

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription \$2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Book Editor

ARNOLD E. CARLSON

Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

Circulation Manager

LOWELL J. SATRE

Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.
LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.
AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.
CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO
WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA
LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.
AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.
CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.
GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA
HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO
LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.
NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.
SUOMI SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.
TRINITY SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA
PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

- I. *Aim*: The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.
- II. *Policy*: The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume XII

May, 1960

Number 2

CONTENTS

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS IN AMERICA	<i>John Reumann</i>	91
THE IMPORTANCE OF PREACHING IN THE GREAT AWAKENING, ...	<i>Leslie Conrad, Jr.</i>	111
THE NEW MEASURE MOVEMENT AMONG LUTHERANS	<i>Frank H. Seilhamer</i>	121
CHARISMATIC TEACHING	<i>William D. Streng</i>	144
FIGURA PROTHYSTERON AND THE LORD'S SUPPER	<i>Gottfried G. Krodel</i>	152
THE SCRIPTURES AND THE CHURCH	<i>Robert Scharlemann</i>	159
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES		
Guillaumont et al., <i>The Gospel According to Thomas</i> (E. H. Wahlstrom)		167
Milik, <i>Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea</i> (R. W. Heffley)		167
Bruce, <i>Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts</i> (R. W. Heffley)		169
Schubert, <i>The Dead Sea Community</i> (R. W. Heffley)		170
Roth, <i>Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> (H. J. Mumm)		171
Barclay, <i>The Mind of St. Paul</i> (E. H. Wahlstrom)		172
Milley, <i>The Prophets of Israel</i> (R. J. Marshall)		173
Knight, <i>A Christian Theology of the Old Testament</i> (H. N. Bream)		174
Harrington, <i>Essentials in Christian Faith</i> (W. O. Doescher)		175
Simon, <i>Heaven in the Christian Tradition</i> (R. A. Bartels)		176
Kukkonen, <i>Faith of Our Fathers</i> (G. Aus)		177
Carlson, <i>The Classic Christian Faith</i> (G. Aus)		177
Shinn, <i>Great Phrases of the Christian Language</i> (F. E. Reinberger)		178
Tillich, <i>Theology of Culture</i> (P. L. Holmer)		178
Holbrook, <i>Faith and Community</i> (P. L. Holmer)		179
Routley, <i>The Gift of Conversion</i> (J. Knudsen)		180
Tillmanns, <i>The World and Men Around Luther</i> (E. C. Nelson)		180
Manschreck, <i>Prayers of the Reformers</i> (J. Knudsen)		181
Torrance, <i>The School of Faith</i> (A. J. Traver)		182
Marty, <i>The New Shape of American Religion</i> (A. N. Rogness)		182
Arvastson, <i>Svensk Psalm under 1900-talet</i> (J. W. Lundeen)		183
Vetter, <i>Magic and Religion</i> (W. H. K. Narum)		184

CONTRIBUTORS

JOHN REUMANN is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, on leave for study in Cambridge, England, during the present academic year.

LESLIE CONRAD, JR., until recently executive secretary of the Luther League of America, U.L.C.A., has returned to the parish ministry in Texas.

FRANK H. SEILHAMER is pastor of St. Paul's Church in DuBois, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM D. STRENG is professor of Christian Education in Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa.

GOTTFRIED G. KRODEL is professor of Christianity in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota.

ROBERT SCHARLEMANN is instructor in Philosophy in Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana, on leave during the present academic year as a research fellow at Yale University.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are ERIC H. WAHLSTROM, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; ROBERT W. HEFFLEY, professor of Christianity in Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans.; HARRY J. MUMM, professor of the New Testament in Pacific Seminary, Berkeley, Calif.; ROBERT J. MARSHALL, professor of the Old Testament in Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; HOWARD N. BREAM, professor in the Biblical Department, Lutheran Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.; W. O. DOESCHER, professor of Philosophy in Capital University, Columbus, Ohio; ROBERT A. BARTELS, associate professor of the New Testament in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; GEORGE AUS, professor of Systematic Theology in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; FRANCIS E. REINBERGER, professor of Practical Theology in the Lutheran Seminary, Gettysburg; PAUL L. HOLMER, professor of Philosophy in the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; JOHANNES KNUDSEN, professor of Church History in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary; E. CLIFFORD NELSON, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; AMOS J. TRAVER is professor of Practical Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; ALVIN N. ROGNESS, president of Luther Seminary, St. Paul; JOEL W. LUNDEEN, director of the library of Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island.

The Dead Sea Scrolls in America: A Survey of Five Years of Popular Literature

BY JOHN REUMANN

FEW topics in recent years have attracted such attention as the "Dead Sea scrolls." The term is loosely used to cover a series of archeological and manuscript discoveries from three sites along the west shore of the Dead Sea, at Qumran, Murabba'at, and Khirbet Mird, an area about fifteen miles east southeast of Jerusalem. The documents are in some half-dozen languages (but mostly Hebrew) and may range from the eighth century B.C. to the tenth A.D., most falling between 200 B.C. and A.D. 200.

It has now been probably fifteen years since the first of these scrolls came to light in Palestine and five years since they "were discovered in America in the spring of 1955."¹ In this time a staggering amount of literature has been produced on the subject.² In America the Dead Sea finds have taken a particularly strong grip on the popular mind, "far more intense and widespread . . . than anywhere else in the world," according to one observer.³ Especially significant is the number of more popular books, often paperbacks, aimed at the average reader. These are frequently by competent scholars but sometimes have peculiar emphases.

It is therefore appropriate to appraise some of this popular literature on the scrolls, significant not only as a mirror of what is thought about the Qumran sectarians but also for what these books suggest of the religious outlook in America today. Of necessity this survey must be limited to books, not articles, appearing in English through 1959.

1 M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking Press, 1958), p. 3. With others, Burrows now suggests that the Bedouin held the scrolls two years after discovery, before selling them in 1947.

2 For bibliography, see M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking Press, 1955), 419-435, and *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 411-424, though almost every book discussed below has some listing. A definitive compilation appears in C. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (Berlin, 1957).

3 K. Stendahl, in his introductory essay to the volume he edited, *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), 1.

I

The treatment which overnight skyrocketed the scrolls to prominence appeared in *The New Yorker* magazine. Most of the issue of May 14, 1955, was given over to a vivid article by staff correspondent Edmund Wilson, "The Scrolls from the Dead Sea," published shortly thereafter in slightly expanded form as a book.⁴ An established literary critic (*Memoirs of Hecate County*) who had done an enthusiastic essay earlier about learning Hebrew on his own,⁵ Wilson now combined these interests and literary skills with a professional job of research, which included a visit to the Dead Sea and interviews with the *dramatis personae* of the discovery of the scrolls, to produce a fascinating account of the then little known finds in the Judean desert.

Until then only bits of news had appeared in the press, usually on back pages beneath phrases of scholarly caution.⁶ This dearth of information made Wilson's bombshell more stunning and launched the scrolls auspiciously and sensationally in the public mind, for there were sweeping charges based on Wilson's frankly humanist presuppositions. He claimed, for example, that the monastery at Qumran where the manuscripts were written "is perhaps, more than Bethlehem or Nazareth, the cradle of Christianity" (p. 98). Again, he hoped the scrolls would help revive the romantic conception of Jesus which Renan had painted in his subjective *Vie de Jésus* in 1863, a Jesus minus all the theology added by that horrid disciple Paul. Throughout there was the innuendo that "New Testament scholars . . . have almost without exception boycotted the whole subject of the scrolls" (p. 99).⁷ And above all there was the supposition that scholars who "have taken Christian orders or been trained in the rabbinical tradition" are "inhibited" in

4 *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. Page references cited are from the book. German tr., Munich, 1956. Here, as in other cases, translations have spread the "popular" English literature on the scrolls to the continent.

5 "On First Reading Genesis," *The New Yorker*, May 15, 1954, 130 ff.

6 A notable exception was *The Biblical Archeologist*, where, as early as 1948, G. Ernest Wright headed a report on the scrolls, "A Phenomenal Discovery," and spoke of them as "the most important discovery ever made in Old Testament manuscripts" (*BA*, 11 (1948), 21).

7 An obvious exaggeration. At that time articles had appeared by such New Testament scholars as Matthew Black, O. Cullmann, E. Stauffer, Bo Reicke, F. V. Filson, S. E. Johnson, and others, some of which were later gathered together in the volume *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (*supra*, note 3). Here Stendahl, p. 2, contrasts the slow and scanty publication (until 1959) of materials found in a gnostic library at Chenoboskion, Egypt, in 1946, which have an import for the study of early Christianity perhaps even greater than the scrolls.

dealing with the scrolls. Only those free from such prejudices can study them aright and understand the rise of Christianity "as simply an episode of human history rather than as . . . dogma and divine revelation" (p. 108), as if such a view were not a commitment in itself.⁸

Actually by the time Wilson's book appeared there were already several items in English on the scrolls, but all published in England, none originally in the United States. As early as 1951 G. R. Driver had published a lecture on the topic; C. Rabin later translated the so-called "Damascus Document" found at Cairo in 1896-97, H. H. Rowley had compared this document (also known as the "Zadokite Fragments") with the scrolls, and W. J. Martin had printed a popular lecture on the Isaiah scroll.⁹ In addition the two French works of A. Dupont-Sommer, who is "unique" in the scrolls controversy, according to Wilson, because he alone among scholars "invoked the authority of Renan" and had once been an abbé but was now "*un pur savant*, without any religious affiliations," had been translated.¹⁰ It was on these that Wilson leaned especially for critical orientation in introducing the scrolls to America, presenting as definitive views which were stimulating but not always judicious. Thus there were materials available in English reflecting a variety of opinions, but none widely known among the general public in the United States. The most radical formulation of the data came through to many readers for the first time in Wilson's book.

All the more significant, therefore, was the next important treatment in the United States, Millar Burrows' large and thorough work, *The*

8 To balance Wilson's book, four articles by Frank M. Cross, Jr., appeared in *The Christian Century*, LXXII (August, 1955), 899 ff., criticizing some of the extreme hypotheses. Wilson's position, however, remained unchanged, as an essay, "More on the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Encounter*, VI, No. 5 (May, 1956), 3-9, makes clear. Burrows is criticized for his treatment of the scrolls and the New Testament; the fact that he is "ordained as a Presbyterian minister" makes it "difficult" for him "to face certain implications of the . . . manuscripts." Dupont-Sommer (see below) is still Wilson's hero who "sent shudders through the learned world," and Allegro's famed BBC broadcasts (see below) are applauded as a break for the priest-dominated "team" of investigators to Dupont-Sommer's then current views.

9 G. R. Driver, "The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighborhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea" (Oxford University Press, 1951). C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953). H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952). W. J. Martin, "The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah" (London: Westminster Chapel Bookroom, 1954).

10 *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, and New York: Macmillan, 1952), tr. from the French ed. of 1950; *The Jewish Sect of Qumrân and the Essenes, New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, and Co., Ltd., 1954), tr. from French ed. of 1953.

Dead Sea Scrolls.¹¹ In spite of its length and detail, this book is for the average reader, "so that he who runs may read." Lest he run away, it is even suggested, in true detective story fashion, that he turn to the last section on "Contributions to the Study of Judaism and Christianity" to see how the results turn out before wading through fifteen complex chapters on discovery, dating, and community life of the Qumran sect. Professor Burrows of Yale was in Palestine when the first of the manuscripts turned up in 1947 and helped edit some of them. His approach is cautious, never going beyond the evidence. In his translations of the texts, perhaps the most valuable part of the book, letting one read the documents themselves, caution is the order of the day in emending and interpreting the Hebrew. The result is solid reliability, not sensationalism.

II

Intense interest in the scrolls led to a flood of publication in 1956, partly based on research already under way but also partly inspired by the success of previous books. *The Qumrân Community, Its History and Scrolls*¹² appeared early that year, though actually completed in 1955, the result of travel and research in Palestine by Charles T. Fritsch, of the Princeton Seminary faculty. Fritsch writes in practical terms "to catch the imagination of the general reader" and show the significance of the finds for biblical study. Particularly clear is the reconstruction of the history of the monastic center at Qumran from archeological and literary evidence. He shows that it was occupied from the late second century till the 30's B.C., when an earthquake and fear of Herod caused the group to migrate to the Damascus area (where the Zadokite Documents fit in); then the sect returned under Archelaus and lasted until the Roman onslaught of A.D. 68.

Similar in scope is a survey translated from French and printed with imprimatur, *Discovery in the Judean Desert: The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Meaning*, by Géza Vermès.¹³ The first French edition had appeared three years before, and the work includes photos, maps, translation of the texts, and a number of suggestions that later discussion has picked up. The book never seems to have received the attention it

11 New York: Viking Press, 1955. German tr., Munich, 1957.

12 New York: Macmillan, 1956.

13 New York: Desclée Co., Inc., 1956.

deserved, however, although it offered dependable reports on the scrolls for general readers only a short time after Wilson's initial effort. Others followed, of all sorts.

More sensational was *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*,¹⁴ a paperback by the late A. Powell Davies, then minister at All Souls Unitarian Church, Washington, D. C. Davies offers a liberal's interpretation of the Essene sect, "the Elite of the chosen people," and argues that Jesus and the early Christians were basically Essenic. For him the "second battle of the scrolls" (the first concerned their dating) was then being fought over theology versus history, and Davies' solution was to strip away theology and return to Jesus as the timeless teacher of eternal truths in a syncretistic faith that will embrace "all the high religions" (p. 131). If Wilson's ideal in scholarship was Renan's Jesus, then Davies' favorite was the Jesus of Albert Schweitzer, but minus any gloomy messianic apocalypticism, a Jesus who whimsically invents enjoyable fables and melts men's hearts with love.¹⁵

A Roman Catholic analysis, from the standpoint of one with distinct religious commitments such as Wilson objected to, was provided in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ*, by Geoffrey Graystone, S.M.¹⁶ The four short essays, which appeared originally in the *Irish Theological Quarterly*, take up the discoveries, their relation to the New Testament, and the philosophy of the sect, and attack the views of Edmund Wilson. The approach is apologetic and lays great emphasis on the claim that most similarities between the New Testament and Qumran can be explained by common roots in the Old Testament. Thus Graystone holds it (pp. 77 ff.) "highly improbable" that Jesus or even John had contact with the sect. There is "no real parity" (p. 36) between the sacred feasts at Qumran and the table of the Lord, or between the sectarian absolutions and Christian baptism because

14 New York: Signet Key Book, published by The New American Library, 1956. German tr., Wiesbaden, 1958.

15 If this summary seems severe, consider G. R. Driver's review in *The Sunday Times* of London, August 18, 1957: "The first part . . . contains an account of Hebrew history, some of it more or less irrelevant (as is the photograph of Dr. Albert Schweitzer looking at a black boy). . . . If . . . Mr. Davies' views of the importance of the Scrolls for the study of Christian origins would have to be entirely . . . abandoned, that would be no loss. As for Mr. Davies' scholarship, many, if not most, of the Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic words cited by him are miswritten or misinterpreted. It cannot be his fault that one plate illustrating the script and one table of letters are upside down."

16 New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

"there is no *ex opere operato* efficacy attached to these rites" of the Qumran sect. His conclusion (and presupposition, one feels at times) runs (p. 97): "Perusal of the scrolls side by side with the . . . New Testament does but bring into greater relief the uniqueness of Christ and the transcendence of the religion which he founded." The viewpoint generally is more conservative than that of many continental Roman Catholic scholars, like Vermès.

F. F. Bruce's *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*¹⁷ excellently appraises the whole subject as of 1956. A layman, Bruce is professor of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield and writes here with an irenic tone. Without a host of footnotes or technical terminology, he manages to convey much detailed information in brief space. His fair-minded approach can be seen in the observation (p. 128) that those who deny (as many conservatives do) messianic character to the Teacher of Righteousness, a sect leader in the scrolls, "are not necessarily moved by prejudice or . . . traditions; their concern is rather that at this stage . . . students should not run too far in advance of the documentary evidence"; at the same time he pleads that more radical investigators, like Dupont-Sommer, "should not have unworthy motives ascribed to them, as though . . . they were over-anxious to deny the originality of Jesus and the element of divine revelation in Christianity." Elsewhere he writes, "The cause of learning has often been promoted by scholars who were prepared to take a risk and expose their brain-waves to the pitiless criticism of others."¹⁸ This attitude is refreshing amid so much quarrelsomeness over Qumran.

One of the more exciting voices in the scrolls discussion belongs to John Marco Allegro, lecturer in Semitic philosophy at Manchester University, whose Penguin paperback¹⁹ speaks with authority and surprising temperateness. There is authority because Allegro adds a great deal out of personal experiences excavating the caves at Qumran and because, as one of the team of experts working on the finds, he first translated the famous copper scrolls once they were cut apart, revealing instructions for locating a legendary horde of treasure. There is temper-

17 Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans Company, 1956. German tr., Munich, 1957. Cf. also Bruce's *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* (London: Lyndale Press, 1957).

18 *Christianity Today*, March 4, 1957, p. 5.

19 *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1956. German tr., Frankfurt/Main, 1957.

ateness because a far more stormy book might have been expected. In January, 1956, Allegro made three controversial broadcasts over BBC, in which he gave a very graphic reconstruction of the Covenanters' colony and claimed the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified (just as Jesus) under the wicked priest-king Alexander Jannaeus, suggesting certain texts not yet published clinched his special interpretation. The hue and cry was great as the press, particularly in the United States, picked up these provocative views. A letter to the London *Times* by team-mates on the scrolls project, that no such sensational unpublished texts existed, brought an admission that much of the reconstructed picture was based "largely on inference."

Allegro's book, surprisingly, contains little of the Sunday supplement style that might have been expected. True, the author still has his own definite ideas about the historical identification of certain figures like the Wicked Priest in the scrolls, and some sentences must be read with great care because individual conjecture and commonly accepted fact are not always too sharply distinguished. But the treatment is never dull.

From England also comes *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* by Hugh J. Schonfield, the first Jew, it is claimed, ever to have translated the Greek New Testament. Schonfield's book is not a very helpful one for the general public, since it deals with a variety of specific volumes in interpretation, strung together in loose fashion and assuming great preliminary knowledge on the part of readers. Further, he offers conclusions which are at odds with the scholarly consensus, like his dating for the Teacher of Righteousness. There is an esoteric quality to some of the learning which is paraded, and "exotic incoherence," a phrase Schonfield applies to many of the sources he treats (p. 123), may be the final impression of some readers. The volume is intended to widen the scope of inquiry; what it will contribute to final solution remains to be seen.

For study of the texts themselves in English, probably the most convenient collection is *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, by Theodor H. Gaster, of Dropsie College, a graduate school for Semitic studies in Philadelphia.²¹ The aim, "to provide a complete and reliable translation of the

20 London: Vallentine, Mitchell, and Co., Ltd., 1956.

21 *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation with Introduction and Notes*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956, paperback and cloth editions.

celebrated Dead Sea Scrolls," is well achieved. The rendering may be free at times, but it always sounds like English. More documents are presented than in Burrows' book of the year before, and full translations instead of selections. The introduction, addressed to laymen, is a model of careful statement that puts the scrolls in sane perspective, dealing "only with what the scrolls themselves have to say." Notes are often extremely suggestive. The "scripture" cited at James 4:5, for example, may be Manual of Discipline iv. 9 ff., Gaster thinks (p. 16). Phraseology is often arresting; e.g., the community is described as "the militia of God—a kind of Salvation Army" (p. 4) and is compared with the Waldensian Brotherhood (pp. 11 f., 96, note 43). The question whether the scrolls restore a long-lost forerunner of Christianity is answered both Yes ("in the sense that they furnish a picture of the religious and cultural climate" of the period) and No (in that they are but "rude clay as yet unmolded by Christian hands" (p. 12), lacking any trace of the Incarnation, Original Sin, or redemption through the cross). Gaster refuses to "Christianize" the scrolls or to explain the New Testament in pan-Essene terms, or to "historicize" every figure as Schonfield and Allegro do; "it is unsafe at present," this translator maintains, "to draw historical conclusions from the texts or to speculate about historical allusions in them" (p. vi). Such honest agnosticism in presenting the documents themselves makes this book one of the most valuable, though one concept upon which not all interpreters will agree is Gaster's belief that the men of Qumran were essentially mystics, seeking release from mortality in the desert.

Reactions of a very different sort have been voiced over the years by another Dropsie College professor, Solomon Zeitlin, a rabbinics specialist. He has argued from the outset that the scrolls are medieval and/or forgeries, challenging details in the stories about their discovery and systematically waging war on methods of pottery dating, Carbon 14 tests, or whatever else suggested an early date for the finds. Most of these polemics appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, which Zeitlin edits, and were later gathered together in a monograph.²² At one time Professor Zeitlin's strictures served as a needed *caveat*; when too many people were too willing to believe too many things, he played the

²² *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship*. Philadelphia: Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1956. "Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series, 3."

role of "Socratic gadfly."²³ By now this sort of aggressiveness which refuses to reorganize its rabbinical picture of first-century Judaism from new sources or stigmatizes Qumran Hebrew as "bad Hebrew" as if this would dispose of it (much as classicists once sneered at the koine Greek of the New Testament) is out of place. Perhaps the least happy result is the fact that ultra-conservative Christians clutch at such opinions to reject some of the more obvious implications of the scrolls.²⁴

An able survey on the scrolls in terms the average layman can understand, yet with scholarly undergirding, is William S. LaSor's *Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*.²⁵ The author, a Ph.D. from the same Dropsie College, now on the faculty of conservative Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, bases much of his book on a second doctoral dissertation in 1956 at the University of Southern California on "A Preliminary Reconstruction of Judaism in the Time of the Second Temple in the Light of the Published Qumrân Materials." From this research LaSor feels he is in a position to challenge "the easy confidence of Zeitlin and others in the rabbinic picture of Judaism (which was recorded by Pharisees who no longer had any opposition party to correct their statements)" with "a more critical approach to Judaism" (p. 194). Accordingly the appendix of his book makes a preliminary attempt to reconstruct the historical framework of Judaism from 539 B.C. down through New Testament times (pp. 222 ff.).

Any tendency toward pedantry in a doctoral thesis is offset by the fact that LaSor knows the questions laymen ask. Indeed, his arrangement is that of question and discussion in sixteen very inclusive chapters. Explanations for technical terms and pronunciations for unusual words are supplied. But the author does not hesitate to lead readers through Hebrew morphology and Ur-Gnosticism and to shake them out of any fundamentalist lethargy which may characterize some people who normally reach for a book from Moody Press. Professor LaSor even reopens the question of canon on the basis of Qumran evidence. One curious line of argument, however, leaves something to be desired

23 F. F. Bruce, "Modern Scribes on the Judean Scrolls," *Christianity Today*, March 4, 1957, p. 7.

24 Cf. W. S. LaSor, *Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith* (Chicago, 1956), 124, 240, and 64, note 17. Zeitlin persists in much the same attitude today.

25 Chicago: Moody Press, 1956.

when he says (p. 92) that "in determining the canon of the Old Testament as found in the New Testament [*sic*], Protestant Christian scholars have generally taken two lines of evidence: the quotation of an Old Testament book in the New Testament, and the existence of a Hebrew form of the writing in question." Such criteria lead to difficulty, though, as LaSor recognizes (pp. 242 f.). Might the Manual of Discipline thus qualify? One manuscript of Tobit in Hebrew has been found at Qumran, giving half a claim. The concept of canon outlined here must be criticized as too narrowly biblicistic, legal rather than Christocentric in nature. However, the general treatment of the scrolls is clear and suggestive even for the specialist. LaSor, it may be noted, even explores possible relations of the Qumran sectarians with the Pharisees and Sadducees, not just writing them off as Essenes of some sort.

A final paperback to appear in 1956, directed to Roman Catholic consumption, was *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*, by Roland Murphy, O.Carm., head of the Semitics Department at Catholic University, Washington, D. C.²⁶ The book tries, briefly and simply, to suggest the "proper perspective" to the scrolls in the face of our present incomplete knowledge. Murphy reflects the more progressive type of Roman Catholic biblical study on the continent. This may be seen in his preference, for example, for a translation of the Scriptures from the original languages as over against a Vulgate rendering like that by Ronald Knox (p. 30). The tendency to recognize results of modern criticism is more apparent here than in Father Graystone's essays. Dr. Murphy allows far greater influences on the primitive church from Qumran. Thus he admits a "close parallelism in phraseology and ideas" between the Fourth Gospel and Qumran (p. 79), not to be explained by mere coincidence or the use of a common source, the Old Testament, and he also suggests that there is "no doubt that Paul is adapting Essene terminology to his own ends" at II Cor. 6:14-17 (p. 94). He is even willing to say that the scrolls have caused a revolution in Bible study, though they "have not revolutionized New Testament *theology*; rather they have filled in an almost unknown background to the historical origins of Christianity" (p. 58).

III

In 1957 there was a slight decline in books about the scrolls. By now a working hypothesis had evolved in the minds of many, that the Qumran community was Essene and existed from a century or so before Christ until its destruction in A.D. 70 by the Romans. Such a view enabled more fruitful consideration of connections with the New Testament, and it is in this year that Professor Rowley's pamphlet on "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament" came out, and that *The Scrolls and the New Testament* appeared in English, a collection of articles by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish scholars which had previously been published in several periodicals.²⁷

The year 1957 also saw publication of *The Message of the Scrolls* by Yigael Yadin, the son of Prof. E. L. Sukenik, of Hebrew University, Jerusalem (one of the first to pronounce the scrolls genuine), and chief of operations in the Jewish army, Haganah.²⁸ Yadin's book is most detailed in its account of how the seven scrolls from cave 1 were acquired for Israel. He sees dramatic symbolism in the fact that his father bought three of these scrolls on November 29, 1947, the very day the United Nations voted creation of the state of Israel. There is comic relief in the fantastic story of how four other scrolls were purchased in New York through an advertisement in the *Wall Street Journal*. But Yadin is also at his best in dealing with the War Scroll and Genesis Apocryphon. His wartime experience helps authenticate his argument that the former reflects Roman military practices. All in all, the book is another ample survey of the scrolls and the Essenes, with interesting personal touches.

Another summary, for conservative non-specialists, was made available by Charles F. Pfeiffer, of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, in a book entitled simply *The Dead Sea Scrolls*.²⁹ Another Dropsie graduate, Pfeiffer retells the story briefly and directly with the generally accepted conclusions and few surprises, suggesting the neat outline of

27 Cf. *supra*, notes 3 and 9. Over the years Prof. Rowley has produced an excellent series of pamphlets, summarizing research and controversy and setting forth his own views; they include: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Significance* (London, Independent Press, Ltd., 1955); "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament" (London: SPCK, 1957); "Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls" (London: Athlone Press, 1957); and "The Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran" (University of Southampton: Montefiore Memorial Lecture, 1958).

28 New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.

29 Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1957.

class lectures committed to paper. "The enthusiasm of those associated with the American Schools of Oriental Research," like W. F. Albright, is blamed for touching off the battle over the scrolls' date, but, after canvassing Zeitlin's arguments, Pfeiffer settles for a "pre-A.D. 70 dating" (p. 28). There is, as might be expected, a concluding chapter on "The Scrolls and the Integrity of Scripture," where it is argued that the Qumran manuscripts give "no hint . . . of a 'deutero-' or 'trito-Isaiah,' " and encourage "the traditional sixth century date" for Daniel. At the same time it is cautiously allowed that the absence of any discussion in the Habakkuk Commentary of chapter 3 in that book may possibly mean that "the third chapter of Habakkuk circulated separately before being joined to the prophetic portion of Habakkuk's writings to form one book" (p. 102, cf. p. 62).

In striking contrast is a liberal's look at the scrolls, *The Essene and Christianity*, by Duncan Howlett, minister at First Church (Unitarian), Boston.³⁰ Howlett presents a far more careful study than his fellow-churchman A. Powell Davies. There is a review of scroll finds, of course, and discussion of the Essenes, but mostly an interpretation of the evidence. Like Davies, Howlett concludes for strong Essenic influence from Qumran upon Christianity. John the Baptist was a member of the Essene community there and "perhaps tried to make the Essenes into a missionary movement" (p. 142). Jesus "appears either to have been an Essene himself at one time or to have been greatly influenced by them, probably through John the Baptist" (p. 185). "Theologically Christianity was a spiritualization of Essenism, as Essenism had been a spiritualization of Pharisaism" (p. 187), "an Essenism which largely succeeded," as Renan described Christianity.³¹ And both John and Jesus were, of course, in the great prophetic tradition, Howlett concludes, like Amos and Isaiah, Xenophanes and Socrates, Hus and Luther, a pattern for men today of heroic and syncretistic humanism. It has been objected by reviewers, obviously, that Howlett misunder-

30 New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

31 *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, v (1893), p. 70, though Renan goes on to express doubt about direct connection between Essenism and Christianity. Not all liberal New Testament scholars and ministers have made such capital of the scrolls, it must be noted; cf. the article by M. S. Enslin, "Musings by the Dead Seaside," in *The Universalist Leader* for June, 1956, where the accolade "greatest manuscript discovery of modern times" is given, not to the scrolls, but to the great Greek uncials found in the last century, like Sinaiticus. Opinions on the scrolls do not always follow doctrinal leanings, Edmund Wilson to the contrary.

stands New Testament Christianity, where Jesus appears as far more than a noble, prophetic teacher; but there is also a sense in which he cannot understand the Qumran sectarians either, at least as they understood themselves, because of his very difficult presuppositions about God and man and human progress.

As 1957 drew to a close and 1958 began, the "consensus" view on date and the Essene nature of Qumran allowed even more particularized presentations to appear. For children there was an account, *The Great Discovery*, with pen sketches, fictionalized details, and the hint that you, too, can become an archeologist and help with the scrolls.³² As was inevitable, novelists discovered Qumran. A book called *The Copper Scrolls*³³ mixes sex and ascetic sanctity, with a son of Judas as second in command at Qumran and a fictional Paul who subscribes to a sentimental doctrine of brotherhood that you can be both a Jew and a "Kristiano"! For the real specialist a journal devoted exclusively to the scrolls, *Revue de Qumran*, began publication in 1958.

But for the general reader 1958 brought significant books too. One of the most helpful treatments was *A Guide to the Scrolls*, by two lecturers in theology at Nottingham, R. P. C. Hanson and A. R. C. Leany, and a rabbi, J. Posen.³⁴ Widely circulated by the Religious Book Club, this little survey packs much into brief compass and is particularly strong at relating the sectarian literature of this Essene group to the New Testament writings.

Two other books of 1958 reveal, however, the real complexity of research by this time. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, by Frank M. Cross, Jr., is one of the best presentations for the person who wants more than a guide or mere introduction but cannot afford several volumes.³⁵ Some of the material included has also appeared in Professor Cross's article on the scrolls in *The Interpreter's*

32 Azriel Eisenberg, *The Great Discovery*. London and New York: Abelard-Schuman Limited, 1957. E.g., the story of the discovery by a Bedouin herdboy is obviously fictionalized. Dr. John Trevon and a secretary are portrayed joyfully dancing round a room at the American School in Jerusalem after identifying the Isaiah Scroll!

33 Nathaniel Norsen Weinreb, *The Copper Scrolls*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958. The copper scrolls are pictured as decoys, to save the real scrolls for posterity.

34 *A Guide to the Scrolls: Nottingham Studies on the Qumran Discoveries*. London: SCM, 1958.

35 New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Bible,³⁶ but since he has been working first-hand with the fragments in Jerusalem he has a world of information available. Some of the arguments, especially in the notes, are extremely detailed and are directed against other scholars' views, but the total picture is a comprehensive one. To bring his earlier volume up to date, Millar Burrows wrote a second one in 1958, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*.³⁷ Here any defects of the first volume are corrected, the story advanced three years, with all the varying views since put forth surveyed, and there are translations of new Qumran documents, all done with the same thoroughness that made Professor Burrows' initial report so standard.

IV

By this time readers may assume, especially if they have looked into several of the popular presentations on the scrolls, that most basic questions are pretty well decided. Early skirmishes over medieval dates or charges about clerical suppression seem past. Everyone agrees that the Qumran people were Essenes, many handbooks say so, and future investigation can build on that fact. That all this is not quite so, however, can be seen in the discussion in Burrows' second volume about identification of the sect. He must head his chapter "Pharisees? Sadducees? Samaritans?" and "Essenes? Christians? Zealots?" Two books make clear why there must be such further discussion.

Cecil Roth, in *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, argues that the members of the sect were Zealots within a "Republic of Masadah-Qumran."³⁸ While other persons may have lived there prior to the earthquake of 31 B.C., a Zealot group under Judah the Galilean (Acts 5:37) settled there about A.D. 6, he holds, and made Qumran its propaganda center until Roman armies wiped them out, perhaps as late as A.D. 73. Roth is most convincing when he tries to pin down the events referred to in the sect's Habakkuk Commentary with the events of A.D. 66 (happenings which others had referred to the first or second century B.C.) and identifies the Teacher of Righteousness with Menahem, a Zealot leader slain that year. But he undermines his case when he confesses in his preface that, after second thought, he now feels the

36 "The Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Interpreter's Bible*, XII, 645-667 (New York: Abingdon, 1957).

37 *Supra*, note 1.

38 Oxford: Blackwell, 1958.

Teacher of Righteousness might be Menahem's kinsman, Eleazer, instead.

An even sharper critique of the "consensus" (Essene) view comes in a work by H. E. Del Medico, translated from the French, *The Riddle of the Scrolls*.³⁹ Del Medico, with splendid sarcasm and a certain amount of special pleading, maintains that the Essenes never existed. Philo "invented" them "under . . . a touch of schizophrenia" to present to pagans Jewish monasticism, something else which never existed in Palestine. Pliny embroidered the detail, and so did Christian interpolators of Josephus. Rather, Del Medico argues, Qumran was a cemetery, and the caves a *geniza* or storage place for worn out or heretical manuscripts which could not be burned because of the divine name in them. That accounts for the odd assortment there, and also for the absence of any fragment of Esther, a scroll that could be kept in the home and not merely in either the synagogue or a *geniza*. Much of the presentation is forced, but Del Medico has a way of posing sharp questions and of explaining an amazing number of details. His book is a reminder that not all is settled. There is plenty of room for discussion still.

Three other recent books on the scrolls are also translations, all by Roman Catholics. From the Dutch comes *The Excavations at Qumran, A Survey of the Judaean Brotherhood and its Ideas*,⁴⁰ by J. van der Ploeg, O.P., who happened to be in on some of the initial identification of the scrolls in 1947. He has some interesting personal comments, like the observation that Sukenik's title for one scroll, The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, reflects the wartime situation when Israel was fighting "sons of darkness" once again, he felt. Van der Ploeg's discussion of the scrolls is normally fair and interesting enough, but one finds extra effort being used to maintain the view that Qumran was completely celibate, "for men only." Another Roman Catholic author, Kurt Schubert, is professor at Vienna for Jewish Religion and Culture. His book,⁴¹ translated from the German, draws on lectures in 1957 and his own articles in academic journals. If the reader can get beyond a rather stiff beginning where each manuscript is described in detail and can put up with a style that draws all footnotes into the

39 London: Burke Publishing Company, Ltd., 1958.

40 London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.

41 K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community, Its Origin and Teachings*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

text, the book has much to offer. Schubert is quite good at tracing doctrinal development, like that of the "Two-Messiahs," and tries to relate Qumran with current gnostic trends. The student who has looked into several other books will probably find new ground broken here.

The last of this triad is *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*,⁴² from a French book covering 1947-57, by a Polish priest on the "team," J. T. Milik. Presented in English dress as one in the series "Studies in Biblical Theology," the book is perhaps the best recent paperback on the scrolls. But readers who know earlier works, like Fritsch's, will find Milik's later, somewhat independent assessment an eye-opener, for he introduces several changes into previous reconstructions of the sect's history. Thus Milik believes that the site was not completely abandoned during Herod's reign; on the contrary, Herod favored the Essenes. He also conjectures that Qumran was burned in 38 B.C. by Parthians and that the War Scroll was a *vademecum* for a Holy War, based on a Roman military manual Herod had had translated. Again there are new views advanced.

To complete the picture, a handsome collection of pictures has appeared, edited by John Allegro, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*,⁴³ and in December, 1959, Père R. de Vaux, the Dominican excavator of Qumran, gave the Schweich Lectures in London on the sect, especially emphasizing the economic aspects of the community's life. These lectures will be published in 1960.

V

At least three observations emerge from this variety of literature on the scrolls. For one thing, it seems apparent that the tremendous concern over Qumran and its caves is related to the current religious atmosphere in America. There is, of course, always curiosity about archeological discovery. When there is a religious connection to the finds, interest quickens. The Dead Sea Scrolls seem to affect precisely those things that are especially dear to many Americans today—Jesus, Bible, church, sacraments, even a quasi mystical "peace-of-mind"-in-a-desert-oasis type of thinking.

The spark to ignite the whole situation was the fact that first

42 SBT, No. 26. London: SCM, 1959.

43 J. M. Allegro (with D. N. Freedman), *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Text and Pictures*. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

knowledge of these scrolls came to many Americans without preparation from Edmund Wilson's article and the publicity it received. Claims of a scholarly, ecclesiastical conspiracy of silence against the scrolls and suggestions about orthodox experts stunned by the scrolls and inhibited by religious commitment from examining them "objectively" helped bring a hunger for "the facts" about these documents.

Notoriety, concern, and dispute thus marked public reception of news about the scrolls in America. Even the usually placid *New York Times* remarked on February 12, 1956, in a special article headed "Dead Sea Scrolls Stir Growing Controversy": "Unless scholars . . . avoid age-old doctrinal disputes in their interim announcements about them, the controversy will catch fire before the documents themselves are fully deciphered. Doubts have already been expressed about the 'authenticity' of the present-day Bible and the 'uniqueness' of Jesus." In this warning are suggested two elements in the American religious picture which made the scrolls such dynamite. The one is the view of the Bible widely held in the United States, even by many Christians, and the other is the conception of Jesus that prevails in American *Volkstheologie*. The notion of the Scriptures is often fundamentalistic, colored by some shade of verbal inspiration and a crude bibliolatry that regards the Book with an awe immune to much of modern criticism. Yet the picture of Christ, in addition to a heritage from fundamentalism and revivalists, still reflects, I suggest, much of liberalism's emphasis on the life of Jesus and his teachings. The result is a sort of "Jesusism"; he is the Great and Unique Teacher, Noble Friend, and Ideal Buddy, who provides men with common sense laws of life and "eternal truths" of the spirit. Since implications from the scrolls hit directly in one way or another at both these notions (a fundamentalistic conception of the Bible, and a sentimental, somewhat liberalistic view of the life of Jesus), people reacted as they did.

Krister Stendahl observes that it is the relation of the scrolls to the New Testament (that part of the Bible which Americans know best and which deals with Jesus' life) "which has been the catalyst responsible for the wide interest in the Qumran discoveries. It is as a potential threat to Christianity, its claims, and its doctrines that the Scrolls have caught the imagination of laymen and clergy."⁴⁴ Thus the scrolls sprang

to prominence in the United States because they touched the raw nerve of certain unresolved problems and sacred shibboleths in popular theology. Stendahl adds, "The more popular discussion about the Scrolls and the New Testament has brought into the open the tragic fact that very little of the spirit and the results of modern biblical studies has reached outside the walls of our seminaries and divinity schools."⁴⁵ Too often a seminarian does lip service to the findings of contemporary Bible study for three years but in the parish follows the line of least resistance in preaching and teaching and bows to the entrenched biblicism and dominant "Jesusism" of American *Volkstheologie*.

A second observation on the popular literature about the scrolls is that often writers take pen in hand with some particular presuppositions or assumptions in mind. They employ the scrolls to find what they want there, and "conclusions" are sometimes restatements of the (unexpressed) premises.

Certainly there are presuppositions involved in Wilson's suggestion that only "a secular scholar is really quite free to grapple with the problems of the Dead Sea discoveries" (p. 101)—preferably a former priest who "resembles Renan" (p. 100). Curiously enough, the same type of presuppositional thinking crops up in an article by an extremely conservative "Bible scholar" who argues that people who try to trace Christianity to "Essen[sic] doctrines" "definitely reveal a bias and are not to be trusted even in handling the evidence furnished in these new scrolls."⁴⁶ One likewise can clearly see the liberal assumptions in the books by Davies and Howlett. The purpose of the scrolls for them is to revive the type of Jesus hailed in Renan's day or in Schweitzer's terms. The scrolls are here used to reinvigorate the liberal case before a fascinated public, but plainly on the basis of particular theological tenets.

Fundamentalists have presuppositions too and find the scrolls useful in voicing them. People of this mind usually espouse traditional views on authorship or date for a biblical book, and so the documents from Qumran are employed to furnish fresh ammunition against the higher critics. Thus they can now argue, rightly in this case, that the contents of the scrolls allow for an early Palestinian milieu for the

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁴⁶ C. L. Randall, "The Folly of Placing Too Much Confidence in What Is Being Claimed for the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Slavic Evangel* (Slavic Missionary Society, Inc., Chicago, Ill.), January-February, 1956, p. 8.

Fourth Gospel, rather than a late one in a Hellenistic environment. But they have also taken the Isaiah Scroll and eagerly noted that there is no space between chapters 39 and 40 in that early manuscript. Here was proof for them that the "Second Isaiah" of the "godless" critics could be buried once and for all. But as F. F. Bruce points out in his book (p. 60), this fact proves nothing of the sort. In fact, it could explode right in the conservative's face, for there is a break of three lines between Isaiah 33 and 34 in the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll, and back in 1882 William Robertson Smith had argued that Second Isaiah began at chapter 34! Such an argument from the scrolls might discredit current critical analysis but it would "confirm" an earlier dissection of Isaiah.

Roman Catholic writers also have used the scrolls for their own purposes. Father Graystone hails, for example, the emphasis on celibacy in the Qumran sect; "let no one now object against the virginity of Mary or her virginal marriage with St. Joseph that voluntary celibacy for a higher motive was a thing unheard of and morally impossible among Jews of that time" (p. 78). Some writers, like Del Medico, nonetheless, do object vehemently to any celibate monasticism imputed to Palestinian Judaism in the first century. Dr. Murphy, in his book, it might be added, allows that the sect's "teaching and practice of celibacy is not clear: married life is presupposed in the Damascus Document, but there is merely a passing reference to women in the Manual of Discipline" (p. 86)—which leaves such matters undecided for the present, "demonstrated" only if you make your own conclusions an assumption too.

F. F. Bruce retells the story (p. 48), to take one final illustration, about sacramentarian presuppositionalism, concerning a scholar who claimed the table at the so-called *scriptorium* in Qumran could not possibly be used for writing but must have been intended for Christian love-feasts. To which another scholar replied that the gentleman overlooked the two inkwells found in the scriptorium. "But perhaps," he added, "he regards these as chalices!"

A final necessary comment is that, in spite of all the loud assertions on the meaning of the finds, many areas of interpretation are still under debate and will continue to be for a long time. Examples on minute points of Hebrew readings are easy to multiply, but I refer to bigger issues. Some scholars still question whether there is a proved connection

between the ruins at Qumran and the manuscripts found in the caves nearby. Certainly there are enough problems involved to give one pause at too facile an equation of the sectarians with the Essenes, though the best working hypothesis at present may well be that they were "Essenic."

Specific points in the history of the sect remain open. Were they on bad terms with Herod (so Fritsch and many others) or good (Milik)? Did they take refuge in Damascus during his reign, or is "Damascus" symbolic, as at Amos 5:27 (Gaster, pp. 4, 24), or is the sense open and immaterial (Schubert, p. 83)? The identity of the Teacher of Righteousness remains a mystery, in spite of many theories. All too much ink was spilled, to take a last example, over an astonishing phrase (according to the first translators) in the Rule of the Community about the event of "God begetting the Messiah." After long debate over the incarnational aspects of this unparalleled Hebrew phrase, the most convincing explanation seems to me that of Morton Smith, that the text really refers to an inspection of blemishes by priestly health officers (cf. Deut. 24:8, Lu. 17:14)!⁴⁷

Indeed, amid all the sound and fury over the scrolls there have been many false alarms in the past five years of popular literature. Again and again these have been caused by the presuppositions with which some writers have used the scrolls and by the very response with which books geared to the average reader have met in the American religious scene. The student of the Bible and of early Christian history will do well to keep aware, through books from several standpoints, of the continuing investigations into the materials, remembering the diversity of approaches and the genuine significance of these finds.

47 "'God's Begetting the Messiah' in IQSa," *New Testament Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (April, 1959), pp. 218-224.

The Importance of Preaching in the Great Awakening

BY LESLIE CONRAD, JR.

THE fourth decade of the eighteenth century found the American colonies ideally tempered for the Great Awakening. The difference between the church and the world was rapidly vanishing. Church discipline was largely neglected, and a serious concern for morals was absent. When a preacher faced his audience, he was required to address two major groups, the regenerates and the unregenerates. The regenerates demonstrated substantial good qualities of thought, feeling, speech, and conduct. The unregenerates were regarded by the church, by their fellow parishioners, and by themselves—at least supposedly—as impenitent pew-sitters, fully destitute of faith, and traveling the road to perdition. It was not uncommon for church records to contain the names of those who were determined to be on their respective roads to heaven and hell.¹

The people who participated in religious activities found them rather time-consuming and tiring. They spent long hours in bare meeting houses. The sermon sometimes measured four hours in length, and the cruel intensity of it may have been a substitute for heat in the meeting house. The form of worship was simple. The elements were prayer, praise, the Scriptures, and the sermon. The only possible variations were in the arrangement of the elements.²

Sermons were preached with little feeling, and they were heard with an emotional response proportionate to the stimulus. Leslie Stephens' remark that a critical vocabulary of dull, duller, and dullest was sufficient to describe the English pulpit offerings of this period may be somewhat severe for the sermons in the American colonies. Yet a large measure of the Great Awakening's sudden success lay in the absence of dullness in the preaching styles of its leaders.

1 Joseph Tracy, *The Great Awakening—A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield* (Boston, 1842), pp. 1-3.

2 Gaius Glenn Atkins and Frederick L. Fagley, *History of American Congregationalism* (Boston, 1942), pp. 100, 101.

Dull as the delivered dissertations may have been, the pew-sitter was well aware that the preacher in the pulpit was all-powerful. The congregation found it advisable to keep quiet when the minister spoke. The official theory was for the spokesman of society—be he governor or minister—to inform the society, by divine right, what it should or should not do, without any regard to its immediate interests, whether emotional or economic. What actually developed was a practice that completely contradicted the theory. "Instead of the minister standing in his pulpit, saying: 'I speak; you keep quiet,' he found himself, bit by bit, assuming the posture of pleading with the people: 'Come, and speak up.' He did not know what was happening. He began to find out only in the Great Awakening, when the people at last and multitudinously spoke up."³

The Small Awakenings. The generally gray and overcast religious skies provided a few bright—but usually brief—sunny break-throughs in the form of small-scale awakenings prior to the Great Awakening. Invariably, the "little awakenings" were the direct result of preachers who dared to be different. Theodore J. Frelinghuysen was one of these; in fact, he rightly deserves to be called the first outstanding American revivalist.⁴

Frelinghuysen had been properly schooled in German Pietism. The pietistic movement of Spener and Francke stressed (a) preaching a simple religion of the heart, (b) emphasis on the "second birth" and the fellowship created among all who shared this experience; (c) devotional reading of the Bible; (d) "the priesthood of all believers" as developed from Luther; (e) and the plea for holiness, philanthropy, and evangelism.⁵ When Domine Frelinghuysen accepted his call to become pastor of four Dutch Reformed churches in the Raritan valley in New Jersey, he did not forget his schooling. The more substantial members wished he had; the young generation of members were glad he had not. Despite strong opposition, he continued his direct, pungent, evangelical preaching, and conversions were frequent until even his elders and deacons—the former ringleaders of the opposition—had experienced the "new birth." The revival reached its height in 1726 and was marked by a large ingathering of new members.⁶

3 Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), p. 162.

4 William Warren Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America* (New York, 1942), p. 274.

5 Andrew Landale Drummond, *German Protestantism Since Luther* (London, 1951), p. 56.

6 Sweet, *op. cit.*, pp. 274, 275.

Pietism was also responsible for the first wave of revivalism among the Germans in Pennsylvania. German immigration began to flow into the American colonies late in the seventeenth century, and became a mighty tide with the opening of the eighteenth. Most of these new settlers emigrated from southern Germany where Pietism had won many adherents. A noteworthy revival was experienced in Germantown, Pa., in 1722.⁷

The first revivalist in New England was Solomon Stoddard, the grandfather of Jonathan Edwards. At Northampton, the most important inland town in the colony, Stoddard recorded five revival "harvests," as he labeled them: 1679, 1683, 1696, 1712, and 1718.⁸ But Stoddard as a preacher, or as a revivalist, was not in the same class with his illustrious grandson who arrived in Northampton in 1727 to serve as the second man on the parish staff. It was not long before young Jonathan Edwards was generating a brand new religious atmosphere. His first real harvest came during 1734-35. It was unquestionably the most vital of the pre-Great Awakening revivals.⁹ More than three hundred souls were saved.

Edwards' pulpit discourses were doctrinal, and the language employed was the familiar Calvinistic idiom. The difference was noticeable in the way Edwards dared to make the members of his congregation feel singled out as sinners. In his sermonic applications he was bold enough to call the roll of the town's sins, making it appear that he was actually walking up and down the village street, pointing his accusing finger at one house after another, unearthing secret sins and holding them up for all to see.¹⁰

George Whitefield and his Associates. The leader and chief preacher of the Great Awakening was the young Englishman, George Whitefield. He was ordained in the Church of England on June 20, 1736, at the age of twenty-one. In less than two years he was the preaching phenomenon of England. Both his message and his method were different. He could deliver the spoken word as marvelously as any mortal

7 Charles Hartshorn Maxson, *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies* (Chicago, 1920), p. 140.

8 Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

9 Maxson, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

10 Sweet, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

man. John Chrysostom, "the Golden Mouth," may have been Whitefield's equal as a pulpit orator, but he was not his superior.

Had public opinion polls been conducted during the eighteenth century, and had the tens of millions who heard Whitefield's sermons been asked, "Why do you like Mr. Whitefield's preaching?" one of the most common replies would have been, "He preaches extempore." In a day when most sermons were delivered either from full manuscript or bulky notes, Whitefield dared to employ a manuscriptless, noteless form of delivery.

The Great Awakening was launched in November, 1739. George Whitefield, "the Great Awakener," took up visitor's residence in Philadelphia on November 3, 1739, and on the following afternoon preached his first sermon in the City of Brotherly Love.¹¹ For the next fifteen months the American colonists flocked to hear the most marvelous preacher of the century. Three weeks' work is recorded in this brief sentence: "Preached to ten thousand persons every day for twenty days."

It is a generally accepted fact that youth attracts youth. George Whitefield was a youthful twenty-four years of age when he arrived in Philadelphia in 1739. With few exceptions, his most stalwart associates were preachers who were young in years and young in spirit. Jonathan Edwards, one of his older associates—he was eleven years Whitefield's senior—observed: "The state of the present revival of religion, has an awful aspect upon those that are advanced in years. The work has been chiefly amongst those that are young; and comparatively but a few others have been made partakers of it. And, indeed, it has commonly been so, when God has begun any great work, for the revival of his church; he has taken young people, and cast off the old and stiff-necked generation."¹²

Although Whitefield left no rating-sheet of his numerous preacher-associates, Jonathan Edwards must have been one of "the big three." Whitefield penned these comments in his journal on Friday, October 17, 1740: "Mr. Edwards is a solid, excellent Christian. I think I have not seen his fellow in all New England."¹³ Had Whitefield been asked to

11 *Whitefield's Journals to Which Is Prefixed His "Short Account" and "Further Account"* (London, n.d.), V, p. 337.

12 Jonathan Edwards, *Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England, 1740* (New York, 1879), p. 410.

13 *Whitefield's Journals*, VII, p. 478.

name the best preacher of the Great Awakening, it seems likely from his writings that Gilbert Tennent would have been his selection. Gilbert was one of the sons of the founder of the "Log College," located near Philadelphia. After Whitefield heard Gilbert Tennent preach for the first time, he registered his thoughts like this:

Then I went to the meeting-house to hear Mr. Gilbert Tennent preach, and never before heard such a searching sermon. He convinced me more and more that we can preach the Gospel of Christ no further than we have experienced the power of it in our own hearts. Being deeply convicted of sin, by God's Holy Spirit, at his first conversion, Mr. Tennent has learned experimentally to dissect the heart of the natural man. Hypocrites must either soon be converted or enraged at his preaching. He is a son of thunder, and does not fear the faces of men.¹⁴

The most prominent awakener in the South was a planter by the name of Samuel Morris. He made his contribution by preaching some of Whitefield's printed sermons that he had acquired. He began by holding reading sessions in his home, inviting neighbors to participate. Later, reading houses were erected to accommodate the throngs that assembled in various surrounding communities.¹⁵

There were many other preachers who contributed mightily to the success of the Great Awakening. There was John Cross at Barking Bridge, New Jersey.¹⁶ Who has ever heard of Samuel Buell? Yet young Buell, just one year out of college, wrote to Eleazer Wheelock in 1742: "I have letters and invitations to Preach from all Parts. . . . The world rages, hell trembles, heaven Rejoyces. . . . But my hands are full, Great numbers are Daily hanging about me for Some Spiritual morsle."¹⁷

Probably the most controversial associate of Whitefield was James Davenport. At the age of twenty-two, Davenport became minister of the church at Southold, Long Island. Whitefield's triumphs as a traveling evangelist influenced him to leave his congregation and become a roving preacher. While Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent kept fires at full flame, Davenport was setting off explosions. Nevertheless, Whitefield admired his ability: "Was agreeably refreshed in the evening with one Mr. Davenport, whom God has lately highly honoured, by making

14 *Ibid*, V, p. 344.

15 Sweet, *op. cit.*, pp. 294, 295.

16 *Whitefield's Journals*, V, p. 348.

17 Edwin Scott Gaustad, *The Great Awakening in New England* (New York, 1957), p. 44.

use of his ministry for the conversion of many at the east end of Long Island. He is looked upon as an enthusiast and a madman by many of his reverend pharisaical brethren; and as far as I can find, there is as great enmity against the work of God in the hearts of most even of the Dissenters (though they preach the doctrine of grace) as there is on our clergy, who, for the generality, entirely disown them."¹⁸

* *Lutherans and the Great Awakening.* Lutherans did not play a prominent part in the Great Awakening. This is understandable when it is recalled that Henry Melchior Muhlenberg did not arrive in Philadelphia until November 25, 1742—more than three years after the launching of the Great Awakening. Nevertheless, the Awakening made its impact on Lutheran preachers and parishioners, and vice versa.

The Great Awakening produced a demand for preaching by a preacher. Muhlenberg quickly realized that it was humanly impossible for him to hold services each week at Philadelphia, Providence, and New Hanover. He suggested that a sermon be read to the congregation assembled by a layman. But the people would have none of it: "*Viva vox docet*; we can read sermons for ourselves at home; we don't have to travel four, five, six, or seven miles and pass through rivers, swamps, and thickets for such purpose."¹⁹

The sermons of the Great Awakening were prone to produce considerable tear-shedding and public testimony. Muhlenberg had been in Pennsylvania less than two months when he wrote in his Journal: "Today was a pleasant day as far as the weather was concerned. . . . I read for this time the Gospel and took the text from Matthew 11:28 ff., 'Come unto me.' After the sermon I held a public confessional service and also explained the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The people were much moved and shed many tears of shame and joy, as they testified to me."²⁰ Muhlenberg preached this sermon in a barnyard at Providence. (The field preaching aspect of the Great Awakening was acceptable to Muhlenberg when conditions demanded it.) Three weeks later his preaching at New Hanover produced the same effects: "On this occasion I also gave the congregation an exhortation which they received with tears."²¹

18 *Whitefield's Journals*, VI, p. 414.

19 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, edited by Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein (Philadelphia, 1942), Vol. I, p. 100.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 85.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 89.

Lutherans benefited from the Great Awakening's stress on "the gospel for everyone." Over and over again, Muhlenberg and his fellow pastors make reference to the numerous non-Lutherans in attendance at services. The Rev. Peter Brunnholtz reported: "I often have hearers of all kinds of religions and sects that are in the world."²² The Rev. John Frederick Handschuch wrote: "My hearers often consist of diverse sects, never as yet heard of."²³

The term "awaken" became a much employed word in the writings of Muhlenberg and his ministerial cohorts. The commentary was usually put: "There is an unusual degree of awakening in the congregation." "After the sermon a few souls told me that they had been awakened." "Many confessed that they were awakened by his sermons."

Muhlenberg penned many descriptions of Lutheran preaching in the 1740's, but probably none was so complete as the following: "When we preach, the members of the congregation do not easily neglect the opportunity. They come from afar. They fear no heat in the summer, and no rough roads and weather in winter. In hearing the Word of God there is a difference. Some hear with tears, others reflectingly. Some are inattentive and fickle, others ignorant and neglected in their youth. We endeavor to present it as simply and comprehensively as the Lord gives us grace. Today the Word still falls in part among thorns by the way, and on stony land, and in part on good ground."²⁴ Conversion-preaching, powerful as it was during the Great Awakening, was not always effective. The minutes of the first convention of what came to be the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States, held in Philadelphia, August 15, 1748, contain these two paragraphs:

"One of the preachers earnestly before God exhorted all elders who were not yet entirely converted, to be converted from the heart, because otherwise they could not fill their office as they ought, and too much would fall upon the preacher in the congregation.

"They remained silent."²⁵

Emphases and Strategies of the Leaders. Preaching was the power

22 *Reports of the . . . Lutheran Congregations in North America*, translated by Jonathan Oswald, I (Philadelphia, 1880), p. 105.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 131.

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 338-339.

25 *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States* (Philadelphia, 1898), p. 12.

that propelled the Great Awakening. No strategy-feature received more attention; no human gift or ability was more highly prized. Even the results of the Great Awakening—whether present or future, temporary or permanent, direct or indirect—could be traced to the effectiveness of preaching.

Simeon W. Harkey has left to posterity an able work on revivals in which he has included one chapter entitled, "Means to Be Employed for the Promotion of Revivals."²⁶ His eyes must have been focused on complete reports of the Great Awakening when he penned his manuscript. He believed that the first means to be employed for the promotion of genuine revivals of religion is the faithful preaching of the Gospel. He called it "the grand means" which God has appointed to convert the world. The preacher of the Gospel must be a truly converted and deeply pious man—all other attainments are useless without these qualities. He must preach the Word, the whole Word, nothing but the Word—warm, pure, and holy. He must preach constantly, always seizing favorable opportunities as they present themselves; if no favorable times and seasons appear on the horizon, the preacher must make the most of the unfavorable ones. He must preach plainly and simply, so that hearers, regardless of their intellectual levels, may understand. He must preach practical sermons, not cold, dry, soul-starving discourses on the one hand, or mere ranting declamations on the other hand, but the solid truths of the Bible, presented in a practical manner. He must preach faithfully, keeping back no part of the Gospel because of fear, favor, or regard for the opinions of influential persons. These were some of the major means employed by the leaders of the Great Awakening to make Christ known to American colonists.

The Great Awakening also met the requirements of a Bible-based revival of religion as carefully outlined by William B. Sprague. They are five in number: seriousness, order, simplicity, honesty, affection.²⁷ The proper combination of these requirements usually produces conversion. Conversion was the hoped-for result of all means and emphases and strategies employed by the leaders of the great colonial revival. Whitefield and his colleagues were out to convert preachers, pew-sitters, and pagans. And they had unusual success with all three groups.

26 Simeon W. Harkey, *The Church's Best State: or Constant Revivals of Religion* (Baltimore, 1842), pp. 113-116.

27 William B. Sprague, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Albany, 1832), pp. 118-127.

Many preachers of the Great Awakening were highly critical of unconverted ministers—and sometimes unfairly so. However, it is useless to deny that the colonies housed an abundance of unconverted preachers. Competent knowledge was considered a more necessary prerequisite for ordination than piety; in fact, in some cases, knowledge was the only prerequisite. The result was inevitable: intellectually competent but spiritually incompetent ministers were serving in many parishes.²⁸ The Great Awakening changed all this. It finally killed the false doctrine that an unconverted ministry might be tolerated. Conversion had left its mark on colonial preachers.

Conversion also left its mark on pew-sitters. It had been common practice in the majority of colonial congregations to admit to communion all persons, converted or not, who were “neither heretical nor scandalous.”²⁹ Multitudes of these unconverted members were for the first time in their lives made the subjects of Christ’s saving grace. Of course, there was no census, but in more than one area the Great Awakening seemed to have been almost wholly within the established congregations and to have resulted in the conversion of nearly all the members.

The largest number of conversions were among the pagans of the colonies. Various estimates have been offered. Tracy quoted several authorities, with estimates ranging from 25,000 to 50,000 converts for New England.³⁰ If the conversions were correspondingly as high throughout the colonies as in New England, the number of converts reached an astonishing total.

Conversions reached sizable proportions for various reasons. High on the list was the fact that the Great Awakening had a message for everybody. Social rank counted for nought. The invitation was extended to all alike—poor and rich, learned and ignorant, slaves and freemen. In July, 1742, the fiery Boston Presbyterian, John Moorhead, remarked, “I can’t express the wonderful things which God is adoin’g and has already mainfested among the Indians, Negroes, Papists and Protestants of all Denominations.”³¹ Moorhead’s observation is an indication of the truly ecumenical character of the Great Awakening. It

28 Luke Tyerman, *The Life and Times of the Rev. George Whitefield, B.A., of Pembroke College, Oxford* (London, 1877), II, p. 185.

29 *Loc. cit.*

30 Tracy, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

31 Gaustad, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

crossed denominational lines with little discrimination. Colonial records often refer descriptively to the reception of religious blessings as being "showers from heaven" or "divine showers." In the Great Awakening nearly everybody got wet!

Criticisms and Defenders. Real preaching is upsetting in character. It produces converts on the one hand, and critics on the other. The Great Awakening featured much real preaching; it produced many converts and critics. When Whitefield arrived in Boston on his first visit, one famous doctor of divinity met him on the street and said, "I am sorry to see you here." Whitefield quietly replied, "So is the devil."³² The Great Awakener and many of his associates, especially Jonathan Edwards, spent considerable time defending the Great Awakening by answering the critics with well-prepared letters, essays, booklets, and books.

The frequency of sermons by preachers caused a continuous uproar from the anti-Great Awakening forces. The critics claimed that the point of diminishing returns in sermon-listening experiences each week could be located somewhere during the second or third sermon. Jonathan Edwards disagreed. He put forth the theory that the main benefits of sermon-listening were received at the time of hearing the sermon; the remembrance of what was delivered was of secondary importance. Furthermore, he insisted that prior to the days of revival preaching in the colonies, it was considered the order of the day to listen to two sermons on the Sabbath and then go home quickly to spend the remainder of the Lord's Day reading the Scriptures or printed sermons. Such a Sabbath schedule should have had as much tendency to drive out the sermonic material to which they had listened, as if they had heard a third sermon. Edwards clinched his argument by reminding objectors that it seemed to have been the practice of the Lord's apostles to preach every day. "They did not avoid preaching one day, for fear they should thrust out of the minds of their hearers what they had delivered the day before, nor did Christians avoid going every day to hear, for fear of any such bad effect."³³

32 J. B. Wakeley, *The Prince of Pulpit Orators; A Portraiture of Rev. George Whitefield* (New York, 1871), p. 142.

33 Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

The New Measure Movement Among Lutherans

BY FRANK H. SEILHAMER

IN THE opening decades of the nineteenth century American Protestants were caught up by the revival impulse that has come to be labeled the Second Great Awakening. Beginning with the early 1790's wave of revivals, which continued through the period preceding the Civil War, made their appearance on the American religious scene. These upsurges of "spiritual quickenings" pulsed through the land with such a consuming zeal that scarcely any portion of Protestantism was not visited by "copious effusions of the Holy Spirit."

More hesitant to allow themselves to be swept along by the religious ferment than many others, the Lutherans responded slowly to the revival movement at first. As the century went on, however, "Pentecostal visitations" became increasingly more plentiful among them. Most of these revivals that surged through Lutheran ranks in the 1820's, 1830's, and 1840's were connected inseparably with what came to be denominated New Measures.¹

To a degree, the term New Measures was an ambiguous label.² For conservative "Old Lutherans" almost any change in worship patterns was given the stamp of "new," especially those "innovations" that had sprung into existence with the revival impulse of the early nineteenth century.³ Enthusiastic "friends of earnest piety," on the other hand, applied the term only to extraordinary methods or "extra efforts" employed to bring about or continue a "season of refreshing." As Benjamin Kurtz, editor of the *Lutheran Observer* from 1833 to 1861 and an ardent friend of revivals, pointed out,

"New Measures" is a relative phrase. . . . In the American churches the expression has been employed to designate any set of innovating measures, sometimes for

1 *Lutheran Observer*, March 1, 1844.

2 "It is a very comprehensive term, and has been employed by some to comprise temperance societies, tract societies, etc., and even Sunday Schools and Bible societies. Others limit it to protracted meetings and meetings with the anxious or awakened for special conversation; and yet others seem to mean nothing else by it but a resort to the so-called 'mourner's bench.'" *Observer*, March 19, 1841.

3 Cf. Reuben Weiser, *The Mourner's Bench*, 14.

the better and at others for the worse. Most commonly it is used to imply the particular measures employed by those in any church who deplore the decayed state of piety and who labor with increased zeal and by the use of extra efforts for a reformation.⁴

Thus, depending upon who was using the label, New Measures could be, and was, applied to any number of methods for evangelization that were in widespread use among Protestants in America during the first half of the nineteenth century.

However, five things were accepted almost universally among the Lutherans, by conservatives and liberals alike, as belonging in this category of "indispensable tools without which . . . it [was] almost impossible to have revivals."⁵ There were "protracted meetings," animated, fiery, "heart-searching" preaching, calling out of "sinners" for private prayer, "anxious" or "inquiry" meetings, and the "mourner's bench."⁶

THE USE OF NEW MEASURES

The "protracted meeting," which was the village counterpart of the camp meeting, encompassed all the characteristics of the measures and provided the form or framework within which the other measures operated.⁷ A series of services held for the purpose of making "a more powerful impression of divine things upon the minds of the people,"⁸ they lasted, or were "protracted," from three or four days⁹ to several weeks.¹⁰ So long as any special interest manifested itself and the attendance and numbers of inquirers increased or continued at an acceptable level, the series of meetings was continued, with individual sessions frequently lasting until midnight. Sometimes it was only the complete exhaustion of the officiating clergy and their helpers that finally closed the endeavors.¹¹ Many of the protracted meetings were undertaken as cooperative ventures between two or more Lutheran ministers,¹² and

4 *Observer*, November 17, 1843.

5 Reuben Weiser, *The Mourner's Bench*, 3. Also Bauslin, "Genesis of the New Measure Movement in the Lutheran Church in this Country," *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. XL (1910), 368.

6 Charles G. Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, 248. Also *Observer*, April 16, 1841.

7 Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-over District*, 183, 184.

8 Finney, *op. cit.*, 249.

9 *Observer*, January 16, 1832.

10 John G. Morris, *Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry*, 386.

11 *Ibid.*, 386.

12 *Observer*, April 7, 1843.

not rarely did they include clergy and congregations of other denominations.¹³

Although there was no standard pattern for the conduct of these protracted efforts, a general procedure was observed in most instances. Beginning as early in the day as possible, several "plain and practical" sermons were preached, after which there followed an intermission of about an hour "for retirement and other purposes." In the afternoon a similar program was followed. At night a third meeting was held at which time the ministers would "exhort and instruct the people as to the plan of salvation, and how to maintain religion." At all sessions, before the congregation was dismissed, the "awakened" were engaged in private prayer and given special instruction concerning the welfare of their souls.¹⁴

Whenever possible, conflicts between the meetings and business or "firm work" were avoided. But, where this could not be done, the conferences were accorded priority over the "things of the world."¹⁵

Of great importance in the protracted meetings was the preaching and exhorting that attended the sessions. With deep conviction and enthusiasm the preachers stressed the need for *immediate* conversion, preaching on themes that would "affect" the heart while avoiding controversy.¹⁶ The design of every sermon was to lay open the way of salvation in such a way that if there was a person in the audience who would never hear another discourse, he would learn that he was a lost sinner and that there was a way and need of being saved.¹⁷ The prime thrust was to make each man feel his guilt, rather than to let him think he was "unfortunate,"¹⁸ and every aspect of the meetings was aimed at this goal.

Hence the preaching was "practical," and the Gospel was driven to the hearts of hearers in a "simple, direct, and pointed manner, with the view of promoting immediate conviction and conversion."¹⁹ The reading of sermons or the want of animated delivery were looked upon as visible evidence of an unconverted speaker.²⁰ "A deep experimental and abid-

13 *Observer*, March 8, 1834.

14 *Observer*, September 1, 1832, gives a good account of this procedure.

15 Finney, *op. cit.*, 250.

16 *Ibid.*, 192.

17 *Observer*, August 3, 1837. Cf. September 15, 1837.

18 Finney, *op. cit.*, 196.

19 *Observer*, June 15, 1832. Cf. March 25, 1834.

20 *Observer*, May 15, 1840.

ing conviction of the truth of the Gospel will produce a glorious enthusiasm, and without enthusiasm no lofty and arduous enterprise has ever been commenced, much less consummated."²¹

Along with the "heart-searching" and "conscience-touching" preaching,²² portraying the terrors of hell and pointing to the road marked "conversion" as the only way of escape, other methods were used to rouse the concern of the audience and get the sinners "through" the conversion experience.²³ The recital of "affecting stories," allusions to deaths in families, "violent vociferations," fervent and pointed prayers, and the singing of "appropriate" hymns, all were employed to help the people "get religion."²⁴

Ideally the prayers were brief and, like the sermons and exhortations, calculated to "melt the heart" and bring submission of the impenitent to Christ. Leaders and participants in the prayer meetings that were held in conjunction with or in the context of the protracted conferences were counseled by a well known revivalist of the day on how, and for what, to pray in these efforts.

The prayers should be very short. . . . Some men will spin out a long prayer in telling God who and what he is, or they will exhort God to do so and so. Some pray out a whole system of divinity. Some preach, some exhort the people, till everybody wishes he would stop, and God wishes so too, undoubtedly. . . . It is exceedingly important . . . [to] press sinners who may be present to immediate repentance, . . . crowd this hard, and urge the Christians present to pray in such a way as to make sinners feel that they are expected to repent immediately.²⁵

The hymns, too, were chosen with the same end in mind. Although "lively tunes" and hymns of doggerel verse were sometimes sung,²⁶ the more common practice was to employ those that were of a more somber and soul-probing character. "When singing is introduced, . . . the hymns should be short, and so selected as to bring out something solemn; some striking words, such as the Judgment Hymn, or others calculated to produce an effect on sinners; or something that will produce a deep

21 Benjamin Kurtz, "How the Gospel Should Be Preached," in *Evangelical Review*, I, (1850), 529.

22 *Observer*, August 21, 1840.

23 Morris, *Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry*, 388.

24 *Observer*, November 1, 1831. Cf. Morris, *op. cit.*, 387-389.

25 Finney, *op. cit.*, 122.

26 Morris, *op. cit.*, 387.

impression on the minds of Christians; but not that joyful kind of singing that makes everybody feel comfortable."²⁷

When the impact of the combined forces of the exhortations, prayers, and stirring hymns had done their work, and the people in the congregation were moved to consider the lost state of their souls, an invitation was given to all who were seeking the way of salvation to go forward and receive "an interest" in the prayers of the congregation.²⁸ This invitation usually was given at the end of the sermon, and the response to the call often was large enough to quicken the hearts of those already committed to be on the "Lord's side."

The individuals who were moved to go to the front of the church presented the ministers with the vital and delicate problem of finishing the work of conversion that obviously had begun in the "inquirers." For these "awakened sinners" were in a most "interesting state":

They are, as it were, on the turning point, balancing on a pivot. On the decision they come to in many, very many instances depends their eternal destiny. If they submit, if they resolve to believe in Jesus Christ, if they close in with the overtures of mercy and declare on the side of religion, their conversion is accomplished and their salvation sure. But if they hesitate and waver, if they resist God's grace and expel his spirit, and relapse into their former ways, then they are thrown further away from God and heaven than they ever had been, and their restoration is immensely more difficult and improbable than it was prior to their conviction. Hence, if there be a class of individuals which more than any other involves pastoral attention, religious instruction, and warning and encouragement, it is this.²⁹

In order to complete the process and bring the sinners "through," the "anxious meeting" or "inquiry meeting" with its attendant New Measure, the "anxious bench," was developed and widely employed. First used in New England,³⁰ the inquiry meeting was devised for the purpose of "holding personal conversation with anxious sinners, and to adopt instruction to the cases of individuals, so as to lead them immediately to Christ."³¹

Several variations of the inquiry meeting were used. In some instances the protracted meeting or "general prayer meeting" was closed

27 Finney, *op. cit.*, 127.

28 *Observer*, August 1, 1831.

29 *Observer*, December 22, 1837.

30 Finney, *op. cit.*, 248.

31 *Ibid.*, 248.

with the invitation for penitents to congregate in a nearby building or house, often the parsonage, where the minister and his helpers, clergy and lay alike, would converse with the group as a whole, and also with individuals, concerning their spiritual state.³² In other cases the inquirers were asked to assemble in an adjoining room of the church, or perhaps to remain in their pews following the close of the service.³³ This, too, would give the evangelists an opportunity to converse with the "seekers," and in this way the meeting would be kept up "much to the edification of these inquiring the way to Zion."³⁴

But what came to be the more acclaimed and heralded method for singling out and working with those who were "particularly desirous . . . of saving their souls"³⁵ was the "anxious bench" or, as it was labeled in some denominations, the "mourner's bench." A number of seats or pews usually located immediately in front of the pulpit or altar,³⁶ the bench was first used by Methodists as a deliberate technique for the conversion of sinners during revivals in New York City during the winter of 1806-1807.³⁷ The attendance at these revival meetings was so large that they overtaxed the facilities of the churches and auditoriums in which they were held. The only way to talk and pray with the numerous seekers who declared themselves was to assemble them in a specific area of the church. The method was devised to extend an invitation to the "anxious" to come forward to the front seats which had been cleared for the purpose beforehand.³⁸ So successful did the measure prove to be that it came into general use and eventually found its way into Lutheran revivals.³⁹

As it was conceived and applied, the anxious bench had three major purposes. Its first objective was to lead unconverted sinners to make an immediate "decision."⁴⁰ Evangelists had observed that convicted sinners often would attempt to put off the act of going over to the "Lord's side"

32 *Observer*, September 1, 1832.

33 *Observer*, March 15, 1832.

34 *Observer*, November 1, 1831.

35 *Ibid.*

36 Reuben Weiser, *The Mourner's Bench*, 7.

37 Frank Beardsley, *A History of American Revivals*, 195, 196. Various dates have been given for the first use of the bench, but the later date seems more fully documented. Cf. Weiser, *op. cit.*, 7.

38 Beardsley, *op. cit.*, 195-196.

39 *Observer*, November 29, 1839.

40 John Nevin, *The Anxious Bench*, 41 ff.

by striving with the Spirit to leave them, "asking him to go his way this time, and promising that when they have a convenient season they will call for him."⁴¹ But this was a "dangerous tendency" and not to be passed over lightly by the evangelists. Conversion had to come if the sinner was to be saved, and it had to come through an immediate submission to the promptings of the Spirit. As Reuben Weiser commented to an opponent of the anxious bench,

Justification . . . cannot be a gradual work, it must from its very nature be instantaneous. . . . If it ever take place [it must be] at once. . . . Now when you bear this fact in mind, can you see no use in the Mourner's Bench, where the awakened sinner is encouraged . . . to exercise that faith in Jesus Christ, which precedes justification? . . . Is there nothing gained in coming to the Mourner's Bench, by that man, who for many years has been resolving and re-resolving to lead a holy life, who became impressed and aroused with the importance of religion every time he heard the Gospel preached, and as soon as he left the Church, lost his desire for salvation? Is there, we say, nothing gained by that man when the words of eternal truth burn upon his heart, and drive him to the Bench, where his soul is converted to God?⁴²

Thus the bench was extolled and brought into play as a lever to pry the inquirer free from the clutches of damning indecision and "get the anxious through."⁴³ It was commended to the world as a more perfect organ of conversion. "Once fairly within its grasp, the soul as a general thing is quickly set free; often in the course of a few minutes, and very commonly before the close of the meeting."⁴⁴

A second purpose for the use of the bench was to involve inquirers in a *public* committal concerning their desire to be saved. The revivalists reasoned that the church always had felt it necessary to have something that would press the individual to declare his religious convictions publicly. "In the days of the apostles baptisms answered this purpose, . . . held the precise place the anxious seat does now, as a public manifestation of their determination to be Christians."⁴⁵ Therefore the bench was designated as the place where mourners could be brought out of the "refuge of false shame"⁴⁶ and could distinguish themselves as

41 *Observer*, September 11, 1840.

42 Weiser, *op. cit.*, 8.

43 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 35.

44 *Ibid.*, 35.

45 Finney, *op. cit.*, 254.

46 *Ibid.*, 255.

"anxious inquirers after Him."⁴⁷ "When a person is seriously troubled in mind, everybody knows that there is a powerful tendency to conceal it. When a person is borne down with a sense of his lost condition, if you can get him willingly to have it known, if you can get him to break away from the chains of pride, you have gained an important point towards his conversion."⁴⁸

The third principal object of the anxious bench was to identify the mourners to the minister or ministers conducting the meeting so that the inquirers could be addressed and "instructed."⁴⁹ "What they need is particular instruction, suited to their particular states. It is not by dashing water in a large way over a congregation of empty bottles that a minister can expect to get even a few of them filled; if he would labor to any purpose, he must come down, and take each bottle separately by the neck, and pour the water according to the capacity of its mouth."⁵⁰ By declaring themselves to be anxious to escape the wrath to come by the act of going forward to sit or kneel at the "separation pews," the opportunity was presented to the ministers to exhort, counsel, and pray with the "broken hearted."⁵¹ Once the anxious were seated, the intense process of assisting these souls to "cross over into Canaan" was begun.⁵² A contemporary observer described the scene in the following way:

The minister comes to one, the first on the bench, and bending forward proceeds in a low voice to ask a question or two with regard to the person's spiritual condition. These are answered commonly in the most general . . . way. Then follows a short exhortation, for the most part in the same general strain. The whole conference may not last more than some three or four minutes; for there are a number to be conversed with; and regard must be had, at the same time, to the patience of the congregation. So the ceremony passes forward to a second, and then to a third, and so on, till all have had their turn.⁵³

While the ministers were thus occupied, lay people sometimes were also moved to assume the roles of exhorters and spiritual counselors.

47 *Observer*, January 21, 1859.

48 Finney, *op. cit.*, 253.

49 Weiser, *op. cit.*, 30-31.

50 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 45.

51 *Observer*, December 22, 1837.

52 Cross, *op. cit.*, 181.

53 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 45.

Aroused emotionally by the stirring sermons, by hymns pleading for the unconverted to come to the mercy seat (e.g., "Come, Humble Sinner"),⁵⁴ and by the "sympathetic spirit" that permeated the entire meeting, these lay exhorters sometimes would rise to feverish activity to aid the salvation process. Convinced that it was the prompting of God,⁵⁵ some of the "old soldiers of the cross" would leave their seats and rove about through the congregation trying to induce others to go forward to the altar or "separation" seats.⁵⁶ Others would go to those already on the bench and there offer prayers, counsel, and exhortation to and for the struggling suppliants until the sinners were brought through.⁵⁷ "Set apart on the one hand from the regenerate, and on the other from the unconverted, indifferent, and curious, the anxious ones became subjects of unlimited and merciless exhortation. Their pride had been cast off by the act of coming forward. All alike were pleading, abject sinners."⁵⁸

The exhorting, the praying, the anxious bench, and the other measures frequently proved to be so effective in touching the hearts of those who attended the protracted meetings that at times whole congregations were moved by their use.⁵⁹ The sight of those "who had resolved to be on the Lord's side" moving out from their pews and assembling in front of the altar or taking their places on the bench started many a "tear of joy" in the eyes of parents, relatives, and friends.⁶⁰

Moreover, the impulse to fall in with the emotional tide that swept the audience frequently was overpowering and resulted in many "solemn scenes." "The young, the aged, and the middle aged" would be "bathed in tears."⁶¹ The anxious would weep aloud, moan, cry out, asking what they had to do to be saved, and wring their hands in the struggle for conversion.⁶² At times, overburdened with their sense of being lost,

54 *Ibid.*, 16.

55 "'Run, speak to this young man,' said the angel to the prophet. Are your thoughts particularly directed to the case of some individual; do you feel anxious for his salvation? Does something within you say, Speak to him? It is a suggestion of the Holy Spirit. And the same divine impulse that has moved you to *speak*, may have opened the heart of the individual to *hear* you. Now is the time. Improve it; be faithful. . . ." *Observer*, July 3, 1840.

56 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 16.

57 *Ibid.*, 47.

58 Cross, *op. cit.*, 181.

59 *Lutheran Standard*, January 11, 1843.

60 *Observer*, August 1, 1831.

61 *Observer*, November 1, 1831.

62 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 47.

some of the mourners would besiege the altar "pell-mell," kneeling, sometimes falling on the floor and floundering there,⁶³ while others would drop to their knees in their pews and in the aisles to weep and cry out for mercy.⁶⁴

While this was going on some brother or sister might be moved to add to the "work of the Spirit" and commence singing an "exciting" hymn. Before the hymn had ended another person might also feel called upon to aid the "cause." "Some zealous brother would exclaim, 'Let us pray,' and all would kneel down, and many would pray nearly as loud as the leader, and others would heartily respond, Amen! to every petition, and often too, most inappropriately."⁶⁵ Above the din of the manifestations of the Spirit might be heard the voice of the preacher shouting encouragement and pleading for sinners to repent. At the same moment vague, crude expostulations and directions were "poured into the ears of those struggling suppliants" who were already well on the road to Zion. In this manner the enthusiasm would spread until shouting, clapping, and various other "new forms of disorder" were brought into the affair.⁶⁶

Although some revivalists discouraged such controlled "exercises," by many they were not only sanctioned but encouraged.⁶⁷ For "the heart of the Christian swelled with gladness for the salvation of these immortal souls, . . . cheered with the idea that the number of his companions and fellow travellers to the heavenly Canaan had increased.
 . . .⁶⁸

The all-consuming passion of the revivals was to convert sinners and revitalize the piety of the churches, and whatever measures or methods, old or new, that helped achieve this end were accepted with open arms by the friends of "earnest piety." These measures were adopted deliberately because experience proved that they worked.⁶⁹ Productivity was authority enough for their sanction. Declared one Lutheran to an antagonist of the New Measures as justification for the measures' rightful inclusion in the church, "One day's experience, dear

63 *Ibid.*, 47.

64 *Observer*, April 13, 1855.

65 Morris, *op. cit.*, 387-388. Also Gerberding, *The Life and Letters of W. A. Passavant*, 83.

66 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 47.

67 Morris, *op. cit.*, 387.

68 *Observer*, August 1, 1831.

69 Cross, *op. cit.*, 182.

brother, is worth a week's theory. Give the matter a fair *practical* trial, and we verily believe you will change your opinion."⁷⁰

The emphasis and techniques of the past had failed to move men and restore warmth and vigor to the congregations, so new kinds of energy were applied to the enterprise.⁷¹ To aggressive liberals these New Measures were the "lever of Archimedes"⁷² that was destined to lift the Lutheran Church out of its apathy and breathe new life into her nostrils. In the sight of the conservative Old Lutherans, they were nothing short of the tools of Satan sent to rend the heart of the Lutheran Church and prostitute her.

RIISING TIDE OF CONSERVATIVE OPPOSITION

As early as 1804, when New Measures first began to make their appearance, protests against them had begun.⁷³ The influx of conservative German Lutheran immigrants after 1820 served to bolster the native trend toward a more distinctly "confessional" Lutheranism in America. Some of these Lutheran immigrants who reached the New World between 1820 and 1860 were fleeing those parts of the homeland where King Frederick of Prussia had attempted to enforce his plan of union in 1817. Choosing to leave rather than compromise their faith, these people affiliated with synods and congregations which leaned toward a more conservative Lutheran theology⁷⁴ or else formed synods of their own, and from there fought the "liberalizing specter" and its "foreign methods."⁷⁵

But the immigrants were not the only factor that was at work rousing the spirit of Lutheranism against the revivals. "Students were beginning to arise among the ministry who were not content with what they learned in the seminary or read in the periodic literature of the day."⁷⁶ Pastors who once championed the New Measure system and its attendant non-sectarian theology, as taught by S. S. Schmucker and some of his colleagues at the Gettysburg Seminary, recanted. lamenting

70 *Observer*, December 15, 1843.

71 Cross, *op. cit.*, 199.

72 *Observer*, No. 17, 1843.

73 Ellis Burgess, *Memorial History of the Pittsburgh Synod*, 36.

74 Vergilius Ferm, *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology*, 118.

75 The two most conservative groups were led by Johannes Grabau and C. F. W. Walther.

76 Henry Eyster Jacobs, *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*, 415.

their former positions.⁷⁷ Sick of the excesses the measures had fostered,⁷⁸ they repudiated their liberal professors and went over to the confessionalist camp, so that even before 1850 they clearly were a majority in the General Synod, which once had been controlled by Schmucker and his sympathizers.⁷⁹ As Charles Porterfield Krauth, a leader in the confessional movement and a former revivalist himself, observed in July, 1850, the Lutheran Church was in a state of reaction. "She has passed, in some parts, through an extreme subjectivity, an extreme leaning to the emotional in religion; she permitted herself, to some extent, to be carried away by the surges of animal feeling, and lost much of her ancient propriety. She is now retracing her steps, acknowledging her error, seeking release from crude views and objectionable measures. She is hunting amongst the records of the past of former days, and endeavoring to learn what she was in her earliest form."⁸⁰

There were several bases upon which the critics attacked New Measures.

One such point of opposition was that the measures were new, the "religious mechanism of modern days."⁸¹ With a tenacity that was unyielding, Old Lutherans had refused even to make the slightest alterations in their worship patterns to acclimate themselves to their new homeland. Though it meant losing a number of their youth, they had clutched their religious traditions in a grip that vigorously resisted every attempt to open it, even a little.⁸²

Therefore when those Lutherans who were sympathetic to revivalistic methods began to introduce their "innovations," the conservative clergy were flabbergasted and enraged. The measures were not "apostolic," some declared,⁸³ and therefore ought to be condemned. They were "repugnant" and "not in accordance with the usage of our church,"⁸⁴ was the charge hurled by others. "Anti-Lutheran" and "unscriptural" labels also were stamped on the system as the fury of "Old Lutherans" thundered in disapproval and attempted to drive the techniques from

77 *Observer*, March 29, 1850.

78 Adolph Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, II, 67.

79 Abdel Ross Wentz, *History of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary*, 124.

80 Charles Porterfield Krauth, "The Lutheran Church in the United States," in *Evangelical Review*, II (1850), 9.

81 *Observer*, October 15, 1831.

82 *Observer*, December 16, 1836.

83 *Lutheran Standard*, January 11, 1843.

84 *Observer*, May 15, 1832.

their Zion.⁸⁵ The conservatives sincerely believed that the New Measures were not necessary to revive the church, though they agreed that the church did need resuscitating. The deficiency was not in the traditional forms but in the way they were applied and the men who wielded them:

If it be true that old forms are dead and powerless in a minister's hands, the fault is not in the forms, but in the minister himself; and it is the very impotence of quackery, to think of mending the case essentially by the introduction of new forms. The man who had no power to make himself felt in the catechical [sic] class, is deceived most assuredly and deceives others, when he seems to be strong in the use of the anxious bench. Let the power of religion be present in the soul of him who is called to serve at the altar, and no strange power will be needed to kindle the sacrifice. He will require no new measures.⁸⁶

A second front on which the conservatives made an attack was that of emotionalism and disorder. Many of the people who resisted the measures did so because they apprehended "all the melancholy consequences of tumultuous religious meetings."⁸⁷ Emotional revivalism was in the air, and the Lutherans did not escape it.⁸⁸ Using every means at their disposal to convert sinners, the revivalists had few compunctions about resorting to emotion-rousing techniques to give the Spirit "free course." As a result, excitement of the "wrong complexion" manifested itself,⁸⁹ and chaos sometimes raised its head.⁹⁰ The fervors of a "heated imagination" were mistaken for "godly notions, and human passions [were] conceived to be divine impulses."⁹¹ New Measure men, pointed out John Nevin, a professor at the Reformed Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa., and a sharp critic of the system, relied less upon the presentation of truth to the understanding than they did upon other influences.⁹²

Committed to more rational and refined methods of evangelization and instruction for the individual seeking church membership, the con-

85 H. Ziegler, "Treatment of the Awakened," in *Evangelical Review*, IX (1857), 239.

86 John W. Nevin, *op. cit.*, 22.

87 *Observer*, April 16, 1832.

88 G. H. Gerberding, *op. cit.*, 83.

89 *Lutheran Standard*, January 11, 1843.

90 The issues of the *Observer* between 1832 and 1846 carry numerous accounts of revivals that were marked with such enthusiasm. See issues of December 2, 1842; April 7, 1843; April 14, 1843.

91 *Observer*, May 15, 1832.

92 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 16.

servatives revolted at the high pressure methods of conversion and refused to go along with the revivalistic tide. The "spirit of the day" was to be tried by the Gospel, and if it was approved it was to be accepted. But if the tenor of the times directed to send for some "*nervous indiscreet man, with a stentorian voice, . . . to hurl his thunderbolts until midnight, until a number are made to say that they are anxious or converted and ready to join the church,*" Lutherans could not keep up with the popular trend without endangering their church and their souls!⁹³

The hostility of the "old" party was not lessened by the revivalists' tendency to discard the use of the Catechism or, at best, relegate it to a place of minor importance. Convinced that too many young people were confirmed who had "no experimental knowledge of their lost condition, no longing desire for pardon, and [knew] nothing about faith in Jesus Christ,"⁹⁴ the rite of confirmation and the instruction that preceded it were widely ignored by the friends of earnest piety.⁹⁵

Not all revivalists discontinued, completely, the practice of instructing persons being brought into the church. Some adopted the practice of conducting a program of "short catechetical instruction" for those individuals who had previously experienced a "change of heart."⁹⁶ Others insisted on a more extensive indoctrination of the converted before admitting them to full church membership.⁹⁷ Still others used the sessions that once had been employed principally for the inculcation of Lutheran doctrines as occasion for a course of lectures on "practical piety, . . . explaining the rise, nature, [and] evidences of true conversion. . . ."⁹⁸ But in a great many instances the revivals were disastrous to the traditional Lutheran practice of catechetical instruction. When they could "get religion" in one evening at a revival, the people developed a distaste for the slower process.⁹⁹

To most radicals, the "odious practice" of confirmation was nothing but an inducement to a formal religion which numbed the heart, hard-

93 *Observer*, May 15, 1832.

94 *Observer*, February 10, 1837.

95 John G. Morris, *op. cit.*, 389.

96 *Observer*, January 25, 1850.

97 *Observer*, December 15, 1848.

98 Samuel Simon Schmucker, *The American Lutheran Church, Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically Delineated*, 114.

99 Morris, *op. cit.*, 389.

ened the conscience, and ultimately destroyed the soul. They looked with disdain upon their more reserved brethren, unable to appreciate the "sterling qualities which are often found in a plain, unostentatious German farmer's breast, or *unable to appreciate any piety unless it appears in the form into which they have moulded their own.*"¹

Still another criticism the conservatives leveled against New Measures was that the conversions the system produced frequently were spurious, and even harmful. Prompted and aided by the emotionalism that permeated the protracted meetings, large numbers of inquirers professed conversion experiences. But, alas, many of the once fervent converts soon became backsliders. In instances where this occurred, the last state of the persons was worse than the first. Having once publicly committed themselves, these relapsed souls were looked upon by their "saved" brethren with eyes that sometimes drove them away from the church altogether. Having fallen back to the "world," they often were the victims of feelings of humiliation and remorse that made them almost impregnable to future attempts by ministers to bring them back.² This made the more conservative elements among the Lutherans look with doubt, and even hostility, on conversions produced by the "new-fangled" system. The vows and pledges that sprang from excitement rather than reflection were considered fanatical. Though some people may have benefited from the affairs, such commitments generally were deprecated as "tending only to delusion and sin."³

A system that leads to such a multitude of spurious conversions, and that makes room so largely for that low, gross, fanatical habit . . . cannot be associated to any extent with the power of godliness, in its deeper and more earnest forms. The religion which it may produce, so far as it can be counted genuine, will be for the most part of a dwarfish size and sickly complexion. . . . The foundations of the inward life are not reached and moved by it at all. . . . It proceeds upon a wrong conception of religion from the start. . . . There is involved in it a spirit of delusion, which cannot fail to show its power disastrously, after a short time, in any community in which it is suffered to prevail.⁴

A fifth cause that roused the Old Lutheran's ire was theological

1 *Observer*, May 1, 1832.

2 Nevin, *The Anxious Bench*, 43.

3 *Ibid.*, 45.

4 *Ibid.*, 54-55.

in nature. According to the Bible and Lutheran teaching, it was said, the divinely appointed measures for the conversion of sinners are the preaching of the pure Word of God and the administration of the unadulterated sacraments, and the Lutheran Church condemns all methods and measures which hinder, corrupt, or eliminate these means of grace.⁵ New Measures were construed to be just such corruptions and hindrances.

The conversion experience, which was the all-consuming goal of the system, was given a place of importance that, to the conservatives, was out of proportion in the "plan of salvation." Conversion was everything, sanctification nothing.⁶ Going forward to the anxious bench was construed by many as the all-important step, perhaps *the* step, of the Christian life. It was an act tantamount to being saved once for all. "The whole matter is so managed as practically to encourage the idea that a veritable step towards Christ, if not actually into his arms, is accomplished in the act."⁷

Those who accepted the "call" were welcomed as returning prodigals who decided to "come out from the world and be on the Lord's side."⁸ Those who refused to submit to this test of repentance were looked upon as impenitent, hell-destined sinners who had deliberately rejected Christ himself.⁹ Against this Old Lutherans vehemently protested. The way to come to Christ was to partake of his blessings by faith in him as the Christ. Such *faith*, a gift of God in which man had no merit via *cooperation* or worth, ensured men of the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. Moreover, this faith, or trust, from which the change of heart must spring, *was not the work of a day or a moment* but constituted the business of one's *whole life*.¹⁰ "New Measurism," cried its opponents, was a denial of this *in toto*.¹¹ It insinuated that one could not be assured of God's grace without certain peculiar sensations, emotions, and feelings of the heart. "It denies that faith was purely a gift of God, and teaches that man must cooperate in his own conversion. It insists that special measures must be resorted to in order to frighten

5 F. Bente, *American Lutheranism*, Vol. II, 77.

6 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 27.

7 *Ibid.*, 33.

8 *Ibid.*, 34.

9 *Ibid.*, 34.

10 *Observer*, January 2, 1832.

11 Bente, *op. cit.*, II, 77.

nen into doing their share of conversion, and produce the emotional and neurotic conditions which warrant assurance of grace."¹² In the words of Charles Porterfield Krauth, it mistook justification by sensation for justification by faith.¹³ The continued use of the innovations could only wreak havoc in the church. "No religious community can grow and prosper, in a solid way, where it is allowed to have any considerable authority. . . . It is a different system altogether that is required to build up the interest of Christianity in a firm and sure way. A ministry apt to teach; sermons full of unction and light; faithful, systematic instruction, . . . pastoral visitations, . . . due attention to order and discipline, . . . these are the agencies by which alone the kingdom of God may be expected to go steadily forward among any people."¹⁴

REVIVALISTS' REPLY TO OLD LUTHERANS

The revivalists were quick and loud in replying to their critics. Through Benjamin Kurtz, editor of the *Lutheran Observer*, New Measure men had control of one of the most influential Lutheran periodicals published at the time. Kurtz, the "stormy petrel" of the "Americanizers," zealously advocated revival methods.¹⁵ The first number of the *Observer* that appeared after he became editor carried his manifesto in which he stated his intention to be a "decided, independent, and fearless" advocate of the New Measures.¹⁶ Under his editorship the paper featured articles on the conduct of revivals, accounts of revival affairs, and staunch apologies for the "seasons of refreshing" and the methods used to encourage and prolong them.

The advocates of measures were aggressive in their retorts to their antagonists. With an intensity that at times flared into open hostility they parried each thrust of the Old Guard.

To the charge that the measures employed were new and unprecedented in the Lutheran Church, the revivalists pointed back to the *collegia pietatis* as forerunners of the conference meetings.¹⁷ To awaken the church in Germany in the preceding century, they said, Spener had

12 *Ibid.*, 77.

13 Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, II, 35.

14 Nevin, *op. cit.*, 55.

15 Wentz, *op. cit.*, 187.

16 *Observer*, May 1, 1833.

17 *Observer*, November 24, 1843.

found it necessary to appoint special meetings for prayer and religious inquiry. In these gatherings "that good man . . . spoke personally to individuals on the state of their souls. . . . He conversed with them respecting their Christian experience and gave them instruction as their respective cases required."¹⁸ Moreover, even the apostles conversed and prayed with sinners about their salvation, and who could know for certain that no mourner's bench had been used at those times?¹⁹ The Bible did not say it was not used! "We say, the System . . . has been used in every age of the Church since man first became awakened, and sought Redemption through the Blood of Christ. . . . The principle involved . . . is as old as the doctrine of human depravity, and the doctrine that requires the repentance and conversion of sinners."²⁰

In answer to the conservatives' criticism that New Measures were aimed at arousing emotions and produced disorder, the revivalists had to admit that things were not "done in a corner." But the fact that meetings were sometimes attended by noise, sobbing, crying, clapping, and even shouting was not reason enough to condemn the "pentecostal effusions."²¹ Man was a complex being, composed of body and soul, and these two were so interwoven with each other that one could not be moved without affecting the other.

There goes a man on the brow of yon hill, he is walking thoughtlessly and carelessly along, thinking of no danger, he treads on something that gives beneath his foot, he looks down and sees a huge rattlesnake just ready to sink its poisonous fangs into him. What effect has this upon him? He turns pale, he trembles, he shrieks! What causes this commotion of his body? Nothing else than a mental emotion, it is the emotion of fear. . . . *When we remember that man has but one set of outward FEELINGS which govern his inward EMOTIONS, should it be thought strange that men should become excited under the influence of religion?* . . . What right have ministers of the gospel, or any other persons, to determine how much feeling those who are laboring under religious convictions are to have?²²

And who was to say that the conversions produced by revivals were more spurious or any less desirable than the Old Lutherans' method of bringing people into the church through confirmation? Maybe some of

18 *Ibid.*

19 Reuben Weiser, *op. cit.*, 5.

20 *Ibid.*, 5.

21 *Observer*, March 15, 1844.

22 Weiser, *op. cit.*, 31.

the converts via New Measures did drop away afterwards, but the system of the catechism was not foolproof by any means! Many people were taken into the church by this "formal measure" who frequently violated their promises after being accepted as members.²³ Moreover, they often had no experiential knowledge of religion whatsoever but were only "head Christians"²⁴ or "memory Christians"²⁵ whose "piety" had come out of a book or a series of staid lectures and got no further than their brains. It was a practice that at best was "disastrous to vital godliness."²⁶ New Measures promoted and encouraged a theory of religion different from that fostered by its opposite, "the Catechism if you please" or the "Liturgy or the Mass."²⁷ The religion motivated by New Measures was not a "religion of imitation but of experience, not of the letter but of the spirit, not of human wisdom but divine grace. . . . 'The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.'"²⁸

Nor were the "Americanizers" satisfied to succumb to the darts of the "Confessionalists" who declared New Measures to be un-Lutheran and heretical. That the measures were more akin to Arminianism than to "high-toned Calvinism," the revivalists admitted.²⁹ But they were not willing to grant that the revival system was anti-scriptural and hence unlawful for Lutherans to employ. "The question of doctrine has been fully met, and revival men are found to hold to the doctrines of the Bible, while their enemies are found to belong to one of three classes, viz.: First, to those who believe in faith without works; or second, to those who believe in works without faith; or third, to those who are infidels. . . ."³⁰ Only formalists, "wicked and ungodly men, as well as fundamental errorists," opposed revivals and New Measures.³¹ Such men were accomplishing the purpose of Satan, for it was one of the devil's devices to impugn the doctrines of revival men, tying the hands and destroying the means whereby men were snatched as brands from the burning.³²

23 *Observer*, January 17, 1840.

24 Bente, *op. cit.*, II, 80.

25 *Ibid.*, 80.

26 *Observer*, April 2, 1832.

27 Weiser, *op. cit.*, 7.

28 *Ibid.*, 7.

29 *Ibid.*, 1.

30 *Observer*, January 26, 1844.

31 Weiser, *op. cit.*, 2.

32 *Observer*, January 26, 1844.

Since the revivals and their techniques were not contrary to anything mentioned in Scripture and since the Lord blessed them with *success*, they were not only proper but divinely appointed, whether or not they fitted into the "musty old creeds." Hence the "quickenings" were not the work of men but of God, and those who opposed the revivals were fighting not only the men who were God's tools in conducting them, but God himself! "Will not the blood of souls be found in the shirts of such men? The Lord save us from the fearful account which opponents of revivals will have to render at the last day!"³³ Thus the advocates of New Measures were confident that they were not only within their rights as Lutherans to continue their "extra efforts" for the renewing of souls, but they were convinced that any who criticized them were unchristian and the helpmeets of hell. And so the battle raged, inevitably producing hostility and intolerance between the contending groups. Each condemned and tried to unchurch the other. "They . . . get into worldly combat, tilt with each other through the pulpit or the press, their lance a pen or a sharp tongue, with the usual result of a tournament: meeting to a common centre, and by the shock recoiling to extremes on either side. An old-measure man declares to a new-measure one, you are no Lutheran; the new-measure man retorts, you are no Christian. . . . Each claims to be Lutheran. . . ."³⁴

THE DEFEAT AND PASSING OF NEW MEASURES

In the years after 1842, which has been called the highwater mark of New Measures,³⁵ revivals in the Lutheran Church began to decline in number and intensity.³⁶ Though once the "working of the Spirit" had flourished,³⁷ the measures never had achieved anything like universal

33 *Observer*, October 9, 1840.

34 *Observer*, December 7, 1860.

35 David H. Bauslin, "The Genesis of the New Measure Movement in the Lutheran Church in this Country," in *Lutheran Quarterly*, XL (1910), 372.

36 Beardsley points out that the falling off of revival endeavors around this time was general. "From 1843 to 1857 there were several years during which the accessions to the churches scarcely equalled the losses sustained by death and discipline." Beardsley, *A History of American Revivals*, 215.

37 Some of the locales in which revivals occurred in Lutheran churches during their heyday were *Ohio*: Ashland, Hamburg, Plymouth, Wooster, Springfield, Bloomington, Seneca-ville, Lucas, Cincinnati; *Illinois*: Chicago, Knoxville, Irving, Noble County, Dixon; *Indiana*: Richmond, Indianapolis, Augusta; *Iowa*: Lisbon, Lyons; *Virginia*: Gerardstown, Madison, Newton, Lovettsville, Martinsburg, Winchester, Salem, Marion, German Settlement; *North Carolina*: Lexington, Gold Hill, Concord, Salisbury; *South Carolina*: Lessville, Germanville; *Maryland*: Woodsboro, Manchester, Baltimore, Middletown, Jefferson, Boonsboro, Sharpsburg,

acceptance in the Lutheran Church.³⁸ More often than not, the numerous revivals that manifested themselves were "revisitations" of the "dove" among a relatively few congregations. Instead of indicating wide acceptance among Lutherans, the large number of revivals can validly be attributed to re-occurrences of the phenomena among the same congregations year after year.

By the fourth decade of the century, even the *Lutheran Observer* began to admit, though reluctantly, that revivals were losing favor even among their former advocates. Articles began to appear regularly, encouraging readers to think, pray, and work diligently for a return of the Spirit. "The time was when [revivals] held a most prominent place in the affections of the good; when their very name was cherished with a sacredness which was well suited to their sacred character; when they were deemed essential to the growth and prosperity of the church, and especially to the salvation of the world. But alas! a change has taken place."³⁹ Some congregations, it was noted, had been without a revival for ten years or more. This was a striking contrast to the decades preceding 1840, when there were years "when it seemed as if almost the whole population in wide districts would soon be brought in, so rapidly did revivals spread from town to town, and so gloriously did they triumph over the opposition."⁴⁰

Not that the day was entirely destitute of "works of grace." But compared with 1808, 1818, and 1832, when the Spirit had had free course on a grand scale, the local "visitations," which were about all that were to be found,⁴¹ were hardly more than enough to create a longing in the revivalists' breast for the days past. "Brethren, we are in pressing need of a revival," pleaded the *Observer*. "We recommend most earnestly, for ourselves and for the churches, *whatever measures shall bring us* to special, private, and social supplication for this great blessing."⁴²

Taneytown; *New York*: Colporteur, Berneville, Poestenkill, Sand Lake, West Camp, Lockport; *New Jersey*: Newark, Saddle River, Friesburg; *Pennsylvania*: Chambersburg, Sunbury, Lewistown, Bradford, York, Danville, Gettysburg, McConnellsburg, Berrysburg, Muncy, Hollidaysburg, Fayetteville, Centre Hall, Barren Hill, Pinegrove, Mercer, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Trappe. Other cities and towns in which revivals were held are recorded in the columns "Correspondence" and "Revivals" in the *Observer*, issues between 1833 and 1860.

38 Bauslin, *op. cit.*, 373.

39 *Observer*, January 19, 1849.

40 *Observer*, December 30, 1853.

41 *Observer*, November 14, 1856.

42 *Observer*, January 1, 1858.

But the cry had little effect, for the tenor of the Lutheran Church had changed. The church of the fifth decade was not the church of the 1820's. The confessional reaction in both Europe and America had given a different complexion to its constituency in this country.⁴³ Instead of responding to the plea by working for the renewal of revivals, Lutherans moved toward even stronger confessional standards and more traditional methods of evangelization and church practice. The more conservative clergy had risen to power and had taken over the reins of leadership from the advocates of New Measures.

Protests were raised against the Gettysburg Seminary and the *Lutheran Observer* for their approval and encouragement of the measures and their attendant theology. In 1842 the Ministerium of Pennsylvania passed a resolution recalling the recommendation it had given to the *Observer* at a previous session. The Synod of the Eastern District of Ohio passed resolutions against New Measures. The Synod of Indiana appointed a committee "to write an exposé of the conduct of the 'Generalists' and show up their attempts to subvert Lutheran doctrine and discipline." And the Tennessee Synod, led by the staunchly conservative Henkel family, denounced the revival-ridden General Synod and appointed a committee to "draw up resolutions against it."⁴⁴

To this "fury of the theologians" the revival men replied vehemently. With tooth and nail they fought back in defense of their system, but they were powerless to stem the tide. As an attempt to marshal the "American Lutherans" for a last ditch campaign, the *Definite Synodical Platform* appeared in 1855. Written by Samuel Simon Schmucker, a leader of the "American" party, it appeared in an anonymous edition in the fall of that year. The *Observer* in numerous articles heralded and defended it, as well as provided the battle ground on which the conservatives' replies were aired. But the *Platform* was resoundingly defeated at the hands of the confessionalists, with only three small synods formally adopting the document.⁴⁵ The "odious retrogressive movement"⁴⁶ had won the day, and with its victory the death sentence was passed on New Measures.

With increasing rapidity the measures disappeared from Lutheran

43 Ferm, *op. cit.*, 325.

44 Gerberding, *op. cit.*, 85.

45 Abdel Ross Wentz, *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America*, 142.

46 *Observer*, September 5, 1856.

churches. There was a brief flare-up of revivals and revival methods in 1858-1859 in accordance with the resurgence of the phenomena that manifested themselves in numerous sections of this country in those years.⁴⁷ Moreover there were scattered instances of revivals in Lutheran churches even as late as the twentieth century.⁴⁸ In spite of these sporadic upheavals, however, the New Measure Movement had run its course by the late 1840's, and by the beginning of the Civil War it had passed out of prominence in the Lutheran Church in America.

47 See issues of the *Observer*, 1857-1859.

48 Bente, *op. cit.*, 80.

Charismatic Teaching

BY WILLIAM D. STRENG

THERE is a nebulous quality in teaching which defies description. We sense it, we feel it, we know when it is present and when it is absent, but to define it is another matter. A teacher may know and follow the intricate principles of good pedagogy, he may have a wealth of knowledge about his subject, he may conceivably have the wrapt attention of his students, he may even have the ability of lucid and clear interpretation, and yet his teaching may not be with power. What is this elusive element in teaching—more specifically, in Christian teaching? Is it the personality of the pedagogue, is it the fire that burns through his message, is it a matter of rapport, or is it something else? How does one measure effective teaching—by growth of character or emotional impressions?

Can the secret be found in charismatic teaching? At least the search ought to be intriguing.

What is charismatic teaching? To give a definition is less rewarding than to give a characterization. *Charismata* is a distinctively Pauline term, occurring elsewhere only once, in I Peter 4:10. The term refers broadly to spiritual gifts in the sense of peculiar capacities produced in the early Christian communities by direct gift of the Holy Spirit.

In number and variety these spiritual gifts were considerable. Paul's enumeration of them in I Cor. 12 is hardly an exhaustive catalogue. Without too much contradiction we may divide them into two categories. On the one hand are the non-miraculous or gracious gifts of the Spirit which, according to Paul, are the "greatest gifts" and the search after which is represented as "the more excellent way." The greatest of these gifts is faith. On the other hand, among the peculiarly miraculous gifts (which unfortunately are often limited in our minds to miracles of healing) a distinction is made in favor of "prophecy," that is, the gift of exhortation and teaching.

I am not concerned with the question, How long did these *charismata* continue? Were they limited specifically to the apostles (not to the apostolic church but to the apostles) as an authentication of their office? According to Acts 8:15-16 it seems that the privilege of imparting the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands belonged to the apostles (not the Twelve!), though by the Holy Spirit here is not meant the ordinary or sanctifying influence of the Spirit. Philip could not bestow the Holy Spirit because he was not an apostle. Nor are we concerned with the problem, Did the *charismata* disappear suddenly or gradually fade away as the distance from the apostolic age increased?

This we can posit with certainty: in that same form they are no longer with us. Our concern here is chiefly with the marks of true charismatic teaching. While

the charismatic, miraculous evidences may not be apparent, certainly the true marks of charismatic teaching must be preserved. To use an analogy, while we may not have prophets today whose messages will be added to the canon, certainly our message must be prophetic.

Basically, charismatic teaching is synonymous with Spirit-filled teaching. "The Holy Spirit descended to enlighten men's minds, to empower them with zeal, to create the new community. This makes it clear that all this was God's doing, the creative work of the risen Lord. Waiting, passive men were transformed, empowered, given new hearts and tongues. All this was not the result of slow, spiritual evolution, or the issuing forth of man's religious genius from within. It was sudden, from above. In order to show that men's wisdom did not produce this, they were unlearned, simple men. . . . The Bible speaks a language of its own which is understood only by those who have had the Christian experience."¹

The more we study the biblical deposit, the more we shall find that charismatic teaching is especially rich in three areas: (1) it is authentic, (2) it is relevant, (3) it is communal.

I

Teaching that is charismatic is authentic, for if it is one, then it is also the other. These are two sides of the same coin. There is no sophisticated indecision here, the kind of indecision which made university life and even theology so tragic in the last thirty years. Encouraged by the analogy of scientific doubt, the predominant attitude on questions of ultimate values and of social issues was one of open-minded and easy-going tolerance. The greatest sin possible was fanaticism, and the greatest virtue was to become adept in artful fence-straddling, especially on matters of supreme importance.

At the same time, and again encouraged by the analogy of biological evolution, there came into great vogue in public education the doctrine that all true progress, whether of the individual or of society, was accomplished gradually, by minute increments of advance. Such gradualism, of course, encouraged the easy-going tendency to avoid decisive commitments, to be content with slight inclinations in the direction of truth and right, and at all times to keep open convenient ways of retreat. In time these tendencies moved into the whole fabric of society, including the churches. Its effect can clearly be seen in the tendency to neglect calls of personal repentance and to avoid such embarrassing doctrines as "total depravity" and "new birth."

Charismatic teaching, on the other hand, is authentic, and it is authentic because of the "givenness" of the message. Throughout Paul's catalogue of the *charismata*, whatever their appearances, he insists on the authenticity of the message. In fact, in the midst of this section he writes, "for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace." Confusion is avoided when our teaching is authentic, and it is

1 Martin J. Heineken, *Basic Christian Teachings* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), p. 105.

authentic because it is given. The biblical epic throughout is based on God's action prior to man's response. God gave us his Word, and words are communicated by instruction. To be sure, the Word is only a vehicle, a cradle for Christ, but we can not reach the end without the means. If our message is given to us, then we are to transmit, not create.

This is significant. For, if through the charisms the apostles were given miraculous powers, and if, despite these special gifts, they remained within the framework of a given revelation, then those who are under the influence of the Spirit today must entirely be bound by the same revelatory nature of the message.

Charismatic teaching, then, remains largely transmission or it loses its authenticity. Note, please, with what mechanical regularity those who were filled by the Spirit returned to the historic acts of our faith, that is, what stress they placed upon biblical history. As for Kierkegaard the discomfiture of reason became the triumph of faith, and as the central Christian mystery, incarnation, confounded in his view the claims of rational metaphysics, so for us the major concern ought to be to transmit this message unadulterated. Zech. 9:13 still stands, "Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece."

Authenticity includes a revelation of man. There are those who are ready to admit that God needs to be unveiled, but certainly man is no mystery. Man, however, can not be known except as God is known. Our anthropology will be erratic, superficial, ineffective until we find the truth concerning man in the revelation of the Law and the Gospel.

We will not know where to turn in the maelstrom of modern living until we are willing to seek an understanding of ourselves in the revelation of God through Christ. Without this we shall fall into the error of Carl Rogers. "One of the most revolutionary concepts to grow out of our clinical experience is the growing recognition that the innermost core of man's nature, the deepest layers of personality, the base of his 'animal Nature,' is positive in nature—is basically socialized, forward moving, rational, and realistic."²

Charismatic teaching is aware that there is no flexible system of ultimates, that the self-determinative freedom of the individual exists only in so far as it leads to evil, and that man has no source within himself for growth, reorganization, or reorientation. "For the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable" (Rom. 11:29), "and the free gift is not like the effect of that one man's sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification" (Rom. 5:16). The charge may be hurled at us that such teaching then is autocratic in orientation. In a measure this is true, but along the same line of reasoning the teaching of critics is anarchistic.

Charismatic teaching also recognizes the fact that it must not only reach the will, but change the will. Insight alone will not change character. The capacity for volitional control is a gift of God's grace and not a matter of achievement or adjustment.

2 O. H. Mowrer, *Psychotherapy as Social Learning* (New York: Ronald Press, 1951), p. 51.

Voluntarism exalts the dynamic aspects of existence, for in its popular meaning it refers to any conception of human nature or of the human situation which stresses the significance and the actual or potential strength of the will, and therefore it conceives of man's proper goal as the fulfillment of life-giving powers inherent in existence. It asserts that will is the ultimate constituent of reality.

Certainly we are happy that the will is again being recognized in teaching and counseling,³ though, of course, we ought to call it conation, impulse, desire, or action. The forces that heal are not within our students, nor are they gained by insight alone. From the time of the Pharisees the struggle has continued. We recall how Erasmus at first joined Martin Luther, but when the latter emphasized the corruption of the human will and that its efforts to do good were valueless in the sight of God, their ways parted. Erasmus preferred the Aristotelian principle that man becomes good by doing good. The "tragic" view of man realizes that man is created by God, man is responsible to God, man revolted against his creator, man can be redeemed by God alone, redeemed man is in communion with God, and man's destiny lies in and with God. "The whole nature of man is supernatural, that of the sinner no less than that of the redeemed."⁴

When we survey the incarnation, the cross, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, we ask God in sincerity, bewilderment, and adoration, "What is man that thou are mindful of him?" All this is merely applying the non-directive method of counseling to teaching without excluding revelation, judgment, and authority.

Conflict is constructive. It is a common error in perspective to assume that peace of mind and happiness reach their apex in a struggle-free society and in a conflict-free personality. We ought to recognize that man has more potentialities for insight than we often admit, but for the final answer he must reach outside of himself.

The emphasis in the study of man has veered to an analysis of the struggle within man and to resolve tensions there. The charismatic emphasis will be rather on the struggle *for* man, the struggle between heaven and hell for the souls of men. There are invisible powers reaching into the lives of men—consider John the Baptist, Judas, Martin Luther. This involves, of course, a greater emphasis on the demonic than has been the case in recent years. The vital question has come to be not, "Do you believe there is a God?" but, "Do you believe there is a devil?" By nature we are the spoils of this battle; only remotely are we participants in it, and then only after we have become the spoils. Here the saints agree, whether it be Emil Brunner's "It is of the essence of the power of darkness that it does not reveal itself," or Luther's "Nullus diabolus, nullus redemptor," or St. John's "The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil" (I John 3:8).

Such teaching will, finally, glory in the fact that there are closed questions. I say this with reflection, for it was a real advance when theology learned to speak

3 Cf. Abraham Low, *Mental Health through Will-Training* (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1950).

4 Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947), p. 111.

of "open questions." One of the greatest values of this expression is the inverse implication which it affirms. Whenever theology forgets that there are open questions, it becomes presumptuous and dictatorial. And when the closed questions become matters for disputation, the *charismata* are strangely absent. If by the grace of God our teaching will be permeated by the dramatic struggle between God and Satan, then we shall maintain a proper emphasis all the way from total depravity to eschatology. He is not only the Alpha but also the Omega. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (I Cor. 15:19).

Charismatic teaching is deeply concerned about the authenticity of its message.

II

A woman writing in a national magazine a few years ago stated that she turned from the church because it seemed to have too little contact with either the first century or the twentieth. What a significant indictment!

Is it possible to have contact with the first century or with the twentieth without having contact with both? Is it possible for Christian teaching to be authentic without being relevant, or to be relevant without being authentic? Our answer may depend upon our semantics, our interpretation of the terms "authenticity" and "relevance." However, there dare not and, I believe, can not be an either-or division, for these are like two oars on the same boat.

If we are not speaking to the needs of our contemporary world, then it is certain that we have not really heard the Gospel of the early church. And however deep our concern may be for the world of today, that concern is not Christian unless it is based upon events that happened long ago. Charismatic teaching requires both. Here Nygren's emphasis is in order, "He who by faith is righteous shall *live*."

One may approach biblical history with an interest primarily in authenticity or in relevance. Consider first the strictly historical approach—that is, the approach dominated by interest in the history for its own sake. Now, the outer facts of the history can be established—or not, as the case may be—without any reference to relevance. But the inner meaning (and that is nothing less than the concrete reality) of the history can be grasped only by one who is sensitive to the meaning of his own time. There is a mutual relationship here, a kind of alternation or rhythm, the past throwing light on the present and the present on the past; but in some measure concern for relevance and concern for authenticity must be present throughout and from the start. The student of history must bring with him at least a capacity for deep understanding of the present if he is ever to achieve any deep understanding of the past. . . . In the same way our understanding of the New Testament and of the events which created it depends, for its depth and truth, far more upon our capacity for insight into the meaning of our present existence than upon any technical equipment we have for studying ancient documents or any amount of learning and lore—valuable, and for certain purposes indispensable, as such qualifications undoubtedly are. . . . Whatever can be said of history in general, there can be no authentic knowledge of the history to which the Christian looks back without this kind of participation; and one who in preoccupation with authenticity shuts out all considerations of relevance ends by missing, not only relevance, but authenticity as well.⁶

⁶ John Knox, in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Union Theological Seminary, New York, November, 1953, p. 3.

In our day we have been witnessing a resurgence of interest in Old and New Testament research. Why? Because our students are beginning to realize that if our message is to be relevant it must first be authentic. Butterfield puts it well: "Even within the range of what I might call mundane comment on human affairs and on the moral problems involved—even in the things that would still be valid if there were not a word of truth in supernatural religion itself—there is a profundity of long-term historical comment in some of those ancient writers which it is surprising that our civilization should have allowed itself so tragically to forget."⁶ Even nature reminds us that last year's leaves give depth to this year's.

On the parish level, we may say, when biblical history is ignored, then teaching is no longer relevant either, especially as far as the deeper needs of man are concerned. Where there is authenticity the educational process will gradually discover wider and wider areas of relevance. When relevance is nurtured at the expense of authenticity the former will become narrower and narrower. He who is not willing to receive, is not able to give!

What is meant here by relevance? "Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit" (I Cor. 12:4). If it is the same Spirit, then the message ought to be the same.

Is the New Testament relevant? If by relevance we mean that it dealt primarily with social issues, health programs, prison reform, then there is room for argument whether it is relevant.

If by relevance we mean that man is dealt with in his entirety, and if we include that spiritual problems are basic to all others, then the New Testament is relevant. Charismatic teaching recaptures the "proportion of faith." "St. Paul . . . spoke of the kingdom of God only ten times in his major epistles, but spoke forty times of eternal life (or of life simply and emphatically) along with the verb to live—and this made the Gospel intelligible to all men. Following him, the author or authors of the Johannine writings (the Gospel, the First Epistle, and the Apocalypse) spoke of the kingdom of God only six times, but of eternal life (or life or living) ninety times."⁷

This is quite different from bourgeois middle-class respectability. The subject of eternal life is not an appendix to a Gospel that is relevant, but it is essentially a promise of life everlasting. Karl Barth was right in asserting as roundly as he did that "a Christianity which is not altogether and utterly eschatological has altogether and utterly nothing to do with Jesus Christ." A spiritually starved world is reading once again the sermons of Jonathan Edwards and finding solace and strength in his "Turn or Burn" presentation.

Charismatic teaching is relevant, more relevant than any other kind of teaching, for it knows man's deepest needs and is able to resolve them. From these we proceed to the problems of the day, even as we find this order in the New Testa-

6 Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (New York: Scribners, 1950), p. 24.

7 Walter Lowrie, *What Is Christianity?* (New York: Pantheon Books Inc., 1953), p. 36.

ment, for at the end of the struggle in the wilderness Christ was hungry, and when all things were accomplished he said, "I thirst." Reverse this procedure and you have something other than authenticity or relevancy. "Be not seduced by the wisdom of the Greeks; it bears flowers but no fruit."

Relevancy also calls for commitment. We are not here to distribute pillows to sleeping consciences or to permit people to "ooze into the kingdom of God." And commitment is personal encounter between person and person. "He is clad in a robe dipped in blood, and the name by which he is called is the word of God" (Rev. 19:13). In our teaching we are to bombard, to encircle people with this Word. I like the story of a pilot who told of his experience in flying over enemy territory. Suddenly he was caught in the cone of a searchlight from the ground. No matter which way he turned he could not escape the light. In the end he was taken prisoner.

III

Charismatic teaching that is authentic and relevant is also communal. W. Bousset vividly describes the communal aspect of the gatherings of the early Christians.

Here in the assemblies of the fellowship there arose for the believers in Christ the consciousness of their unity and peculiar sociological individuality. Scattered during the day in pursuit of their daily callings, subject in an alien world to derision and scorn, they came together in the evening (no doubt as often as possible) for the common sacred meal. They then experienced the miracle of fellowship, the glow of the enthusiasm of a common faith and a common hope, when the Spirit flamed up and encompassed them with a miracle-filled world: prophets and tongues, visionaries and ecstasies began to speak, psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs soared through the room, the forces of brotherly charity awoke in an unsuspected fashion, an unheard of new life pulsed through the crowd of Christians. And over this whole surging enthusiasm the Lord Jesus reigned as the head of his community, immediately in his power with a tangibility and a certainty which takes one's breath away.⁸

I offer this quotation to indicate that it has never been the mark of a Christian to be a law unto himself because he is "led by the Spirit of God." The exact opposite is true. Whoever possessed the *charismata* was driven to the fellowship. Christian truth and the Christian church are inseparable.

Christian ideas are not the same when they are uprooted from the soil of the Christian fellowship. They cannot be pinned up and exhibited like dead butterflies. They have their vitality only as functionings of the living body of Christ, the church. . . . And just as the church had been born through the outpouring of the Spirit, so it was empowered to do its work by the special gifts, the *charismata*, which he continued to provide. Against the resulting tendency to concentrate on the extraordinary and miraculous manifestations of the Spirit, Paul, the church's great theologian, emphasized the normal, the ordinary, the constant elements in the Spirit's activity. More important than the special experiences of individuals is the common life in the Spirit, in which all Christians share. More excellent than the unique gifts of prophesying and

8 Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921), 2nd ed., p. 106.

speaking in tongues is the love that motivates all Christian activity. More vital than a Baptism by the Spirit in some past experience is to be filled with the Spirit again and again.⁹

Even as in giving me life Christ made me a member of a home, so in providing me with the new life in Christ he made me a member of his family, the church, and gave me a spiritual home. Cullmann goes so far as to say that there should be no *emergency* baptism because a person thus baptized is not expected to belong to the earthly body of Christ "without any divine sign suggesting the prospect of his perseverance in Baptism within the community."¹⁰

If charismatic teaching is communal, then it will place a major emphasis on the family. Authenticity requires this. Relevancy requires it. The Christian church existed for 1700 years without a Sunday church school. But its greatest periods were those when through the power of the Spirit teaching was communal, naturally centering upon the family.

Such teaching has power, for it frees us from preoccupation with our own resources. Our primary concern is to deliver a message, neither substituting something else for it nor trying to fortify it with extraneous support. Without the prompting of the Spirit our first reaction may well be to run away with Jonah, to hide behind a speech handicap with Moses, to plead immaturity with Jeremiah, to cry out in anguish with Peter, "Depart from me, O Lord." But there came a day when Jeremiah had to admit, "His Word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones. . . . O Lord, thou art stronger than I and hast prevailed." Or as Luther puts it in his own way, "I did not want to do this. God tricked me into it."

9 Taito Almar Kantonen, *The Theology of Evangelism* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954), pp. 20, 90.

10 Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1950), p. 50.

Figura Prothysteron and the Exegetical Basis of the Lord's Supper During the Reformation

BY GOTTFRIED G. KRODEL

AFTER Luther had settled the turmoil of Wittenberg in the spring of 1522, Carlstadt, the center of this agitation, withdrew to his parish at Orlamünde.¹ Here he developed and clarified his theological system and put his thoughts down in a number of treatises and sermons.² Difficulties arose in his relationship with the University of Wittenberg and with his parish, and there were new instances of image-breaking under his direct and indirect guidance. These events finally led to his banishment from Electoral Saxony in September, 1524.³ His wanderings have already been sufficiently traced, especially in southern Germany, where he sought shelter for his life and support for his views.⁴ W. Köhler has established the fact that the eucharistic controversy had its beginning in a vigorous tug-of-war between Luther in Wittenberg and Zwingli in Zürich for the theological and tactical support of Strasbourg. The issue was Carlstadt's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.⁵

One of the major identifying characteristics of Carlstadt's theology of the Lord's Supper is his exegesis of the words of institution.⁶ According to Carlstadt, a new sentence begins with the *hoc* or *tuto* and ends with the *datur*.⁷ He supports

1 Cf. H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt* (1905), I, 301 ff.; W. Friedensburg, "Der Verzicht Karlstadts auf das Wittenberger Archidiaconat und die Pfarrerei Orlamünde," *Archiv f. Reformationsgeschichte* II (1914), 69-72.

2 Some of them are reprinted in *Karlstadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523-1525*, 1/2, ausgewählt und herausgegeben von E. Hertzsch [Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, No. 325] (Halle, 1956/57). Cited below as *Karlstadts Schriften*.

3 Barge, *op. cit.*, II, 124 ff.

4 Barge, *op. cit.*, II, 138 ff.; 297 ff.

5 W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, I (Leipzig, 1924), 67 ff., where he also analyzes Carlstadt's teaching on the Lord's Supper, and on pp. 208 ff., 48 ff. he presents Erasmus' understanding of the Lord's Supper. Köhler does not, however, see the connection between Erasmus and Carlstadt on which this study is focused.—The most important writings for Carlstadt's view are: *Dialogus oder ein gesprechbüchlin. Von dem gewelichen vnnnd abgöttischen missbrauch/ des hochwirdigsten sacraments Jesu Christi*. Cf. *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 7-49. *Vrsachen derhalben Andres Carolstatt auss den Landen zu Sachsen vertryben*. Cf. *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 50-58. *Anzeyg etlicher Hauptartickeln Christlicher leere*. Cf. *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 59-104. *Von dem widerchristlichen miszbrauch des herren Brot vnd Kelch, Ob der Glawb in das Sacrament die sunde vergeh*. . . . September, 1524 (original print).

6 The center of this article is Carlstadt's interpretation of the words of institution. It is therefore not intended to deal with his eucharistic theology as such nor with his whole exegetical work on this problem. For a detailed account of Carlstadt's opinion on the Lord's Supper, cf. H. Barge, *op. cit.*, II, 150 ff., and M. Goebel, "Andreas Bodensteins von Carlstadt Abendmahlslehre," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1842), 329 ff.

7 *Dialogus, Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 13, l. 38—14, l. 11: Dieser versz/hoc est corpus meum/quod pro vobis traditur/ ist eyn volkumlicher versz/ welchen Christus sonst inn den Euangelien alleyn/ wie wol mit andern worten/ gesetzt hat/ da er nichts von dem sacrament

his grammatically. He points out that *hoc* or *tuto*, which are neuter, cannot refer to the masculine *artos* or *panis*. Therefore he explains the words of institution as follows: Christ pointed to himself when he said, "This is my body, which will be sacrificed to you on the cross." Separate from this sentence follows the liturgical act, the institution of the memorial supper to commemorate the events of Calvary.⁸ Carlstadt interprets the word for the cup in the same manner. According to Mark 14:23 Christ first proffered the cup; then he spoke the words, "This is my blood." Carlstadt says that the disciples drank only wine, since the word of the blood is related solely to Christ.⁹ This means that the words of institution are not connected with the elements. They refer to Christ alone, who sits with his disciples at the table. Therefore, Carlstadt says, it is impossible to prove the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper through the words of institution.

The application of the words of institution to the elements was the basis for the scholastic dogma of transubstantiation as well as for Luther's doctrine of the real presence. Since Carlstadt does not relate the words of institution to the elements, they do not become a sacrament.¹⁰ Thus Carlstadt departs from the Augustinian definition of a sacrament and concludes: the sacrament is an earthly thing which cannot be a mediation between God and man.¹¹ With this exegesis he supports his spiritualistic approach to the Lord's Supper. He concludes his arguments by saying that the body of Christ mentioned in the words of institution is that body which was sacrificed on the cross for the salvation of man. It does not have any connection with the liturgical act. The consequence is that Christ is not present in the eucharistic elements.¹² The elements are to be eaten in memory of Christ's sacrifice.¹³ On the other hand, Carlstadt states also that one partakes of Christ's

redet/ als Matthei 16, Joan 3, 6. . . denn das pronomen hoc/ hatt eyn grosz H. Ein grosser buchstaben aber/ bedeutet einen anfang eynes neuen sententzes/ vnd versz. Demnach/ ist dieser versz in die rede von des hern brodt gesetzt/ als man etwas pflegt zusetzen/ das zu der reden oder sermon dienet/ vnd doch eyn volkümlich rede für sich selbs ist.

8 Dialogus, *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 16, ll. 28-40: Die krichische zungen hat articules vnd pronomina/ welche die genera nominum leren/ vnd vnderweisen/ das man gewiszlich sicht/ welchem wort der articel oder pronomen zustehet/ vnnd welchem nit . . . tuto ist ein krichisch pronomen/ welches anzeygt/ eynen namen neutrum. Nu ist dast wort artos/ lateynisch panis/ zu teutsch brodt/ masculinum/ drumb kan im das pronomen . . . nit zugefügt werden/ auch kan die opinion nit bestehn/ der jhenen/ so sagen das brodt ist der leyb, etc. . . .

9 H. Barge, *op. cit.*, II, 170. Capito and Bucer summarize Carlstadt's ideas: Carolstadius autem contendit "hoc" referendum ad vivum corpus et verum sanguinem, ut verba intelligas: panem accipite et comedite in meam commemorationem item et calicem bibite "hoc" (demonstrando seipsum) est corpus, hic est sanguis, de qua hostia tot prophetae praedixerunt, quam mox imolabuntur. Cf. C.R. 95, No. 351, p. 246.

10 *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 13, ll. 30 ff.

11 *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 31, ll. 1 ff.

12 *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 49, ll. 1 ff. *Von dem widerchristlichen miszbrauch des herren Brodt vnd Kelch* . . . Bijc: Ich halts dafür, dasz kainer sagen darff, dass Christus seinen leyb in sacrament geben hab für vnser sünde, denn der aynes musz fallen vnd zu nicht werden, entwede, das dasz Christus seinen leyb ins sacrament für vns geben hatt oder das Christus hat seinen leyb in todt ans creutz für uns gebe.

13 H. Barge, *op. cit.*, II, 169.

flesh and blood: whosoever believes Christ's promise and unites himself with the glorified Lord in a "*hitzige Gedächtnis*" receives his flesh and blood which were sacrificed on Calvary.¹⁴ The words of institution are addressed to the believer, and they stimulate only to commemoration, the mystical way to salvation.¹⁵ It must be added that the grammatical explanation of the words of institution was not the very center of Carlstadt's theology of the Lord's Supper which is primarily based on his general spiritualistic conception of the church and the sacraments. However, it was an aid and supplied the necessary scriptural basis.¹⁶

Carlstadt's exegesis was influenced by the exegetical work of Erasmus of Rotterdam. It is certain that Carlstadt, as any Reformer, was well acquainted with the writings of Erasmus, especially the edition of the New Testament and the Commentaries.¹⁷ Carlstadt was exposed both generally and exegetically to the Erasmian influence. We shall now consider Erasmus as exegetical authority for Carlstadt's interpretation of the words of institution.

With reference to Mark 14:24, Erasmus states that there are some theologians who want to prove that Christ had consecrated the elements with the words "This is my blood of the New Testament." Therefore they maintain that the substance of the elements must be changed. Erasmus points out that the Bible does not state this in actual words. He believes it more probable that Christ first gave the cup (although he does not say whether it was consecrated by this time) and then said, "This is my blood." He deems it possible to explain the whole passage with the *figura prothysterion*, that is, the transposition of particular phrases of a sentence so as to change the meaning while not in any way altering the words.¹⁸ If this is

14 *Von dem widerchristlichen miszbrauch des herren Brot vnd Kelch . . . Aijjb, Aijjc, Bb.*

15 *Von dem widerchristlichen miszbrauch des herren Brot vnd Kelch . . . Cija:* Christus weysset vns yl alle zu jin ans creutz, da er gehorsamlich stirbt und alles vollbringe das von jm geschriben steet, da müssen wir jnen mit seligen augen ansehen das ist an jnen glawben vnd geistlich wissen, dasz er uns erloset. Wenn wir das wissen vnnd also zurück auff den erlitten todt Christi sehen, so seind wir rechtfertig in vns und wirdig zu essen vnd trincken des herren prot . . . Ist aber Christus vnser frid vnd versicherung, was khönden vns seellose creaturen befriden und sicher machen. Sein blut weschet vns vnd unsere gewissen von der todtet; wercken das ist das brünstig erkanntnuß des vergossen bluts Christi. . . Sihe da der gayst Christi gibt vns zezeugnus, dasz er seinen leyp für vns geben vnd sein plut für vns vergossen. Nun aber so das den heyligen gayst zusteet ist es frevel vnd mutwillen dasz wir dem prot oder weyn zuschetzen. Es ist ain diepstal da durch man dem gayst sein aygenthumblich werck vnd aygenschaft absteilet vnd ayher armen creaturen zu misset vnd da durch ain newe abgitterey machet. Cf. also, *Karlstadts Schriften*, 2: 14, ll. 8-11; 15/16; 18; 20; 27, 12 ff.

16 Barge has already stated that Carlstadt's interpretation of the words of institution are only an addition to his opinion of the Lord's Supper and by no means the center or the basis of it (*op. cit.*, II, 162).

17 Carlstadt quoted the New Testament edition as well as the edition of the works of Jerome in *Karlstadt und Augustin. Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift De Spiritu et Litera*, ed. E. Kahler (Halle/Saale, 1952), 51, 61, 94, 101.

18 *Opera omnia Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. J. Clericus (Lugduni Batavorum, 1703 ff.), 6: 205, F: Qui tantopere asseverant, quibus verdis Christus consecraverit, cum id nusquam expresse legatur, hunc annotent locum, quo res ita narratur, quasi Christus poculum porrexerit, deinde ubi bibissent, tum demum dixerit, Hic est calix, etc. Sic enim habent verba Evangelistae, Et

applied to the words of institution—which Erasmus never does *expressis verbis*—many questions leap up. Which must come first, “Take and eat” or “This is my body . . . and blood”? Or should these two phrases be preceded by “This do in remembrance of me”? Or, does one have to place the “This is my body . . . and blood” at the beginning of the whole phrase, before the “and he took the bread . . . and cup”? This, of course, unavoidably raises the question to which part of the sentence the “This is my body . . . and blood” is to be related. Should it be related to the “Take and eat,” or to the “Do this in remembrance of me,” or to someone or something aside from the liturgical act?¹⁹ Erasmus does not discuss the problems which the *figura prothysteron* must cause. Was he aware of them?

It was on the basis of the *figura prothysteron* and the symbolic interpretation which Carlstadt drew from it that the Reformers blackmailed Erasmus to gain his theological and tactical support for their cause.²⁰ Even under the stress of this situation, Erasmus made no attempt to clarify his stand on the *figura prothysteron*. *His only intention was to challenge the opinion of the schoolmen that the elements change their substance when the words of institution are applied to them.* For him Scripture does not contain any definite statement which showed that Christ consecrated the elements with the words of institution. He supports this positively by suggesting the use of the *figura prothysteron*. Referring to I Cor. 11:24, Erasmus states that Thomas Aquinas had rejected the opinion of those who said that

accepto calice gratias agens, dedit eis: et biberunt ex illo omnes. Et ait illis: *His est sanguis meus*, etc. *Quanquam hac in re nolim esse perverse contentiosus, cum locus excusari possit per figuram prothyseron.* For the dissolution of *s* and *t* in this edition, cf. *myserion* instead of *mysterion*, 9: 338, C. Prothysteros, ov acc. to Lidell-Scott (1934), hindmost, last first.

19 Several of the possibilities are noted, which may arise if one applies the *figura prothysteron* on the “This is my body” and “This is my blood”:

to Mark 14: 22—Et manducantibus illis, accepit Iesus panem: et benedicens fregit, et dedit eis, et ait: Sumite, hoc est corpus meum.

- a) Hoc est corpus meum. Et manducantibus illis, accepit Iesus panem et benedicens fregit et dedit eis et ait: Sumite. (To complete the sentence one has to add: “Do this in remembrance of me.” With what is the “This is my body” to be connected? With the speaking Christ?)
- b) . . . accepit Iesus panem; et ait eis. Hoc est corpus meum (which will be sacrificed on Calvary).—Et benedicens fregit panem et dedit eis ait: Sumite. (Addition: “Do this in remembrance of me.”)
- c) . . . accepit Iesus panem . . . follows . . . consecratio (benedictio), fractio, porrectio, and sumptio panis, with the additional “Do this in remembrance of me.” Then Christ speaks: Hoc est corpus meum.

to Mark 14: 23—Et accepto calice gratias agens dedit eis: et biberunt ex illo omnes. Et ait illis: *His est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur.*

- a) Et ait illis: *His est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur* (on Calvary). Et accepto calice, gratias agens, dedit eis et biberunt ex illo omnes.
- b) Et accepto calice, gratias agens dedit eis. Et ait illis: (one can add here: “Do this in remembrance of me.”) *Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur*, (-demonstrando seipsum, cf. note 9).

20 Clericus, 10: 1565. Cf. also: Des hochgelerten Erasmi von Rotterdam und Doctor Martin Luthers, maynung vom Nachtmal vnseres herren Jesu Christi . . . 1526, cf. Köhler, *op. cit.*, 143 ff.

Christ had consecrated the elements with other words.²¹ Erasmus seems to agree here with Thomas Aquinas and to acknowledge the words of institution as *forma sacramenti*. However, at the same moment Erasmus also states that the "This is my body" refers to the *already consecrated* bread. Here he applies the *figura prothysteron* to the word of the bread. This could mean that one may place the "This is my body" after the consecration of the elements, but with no relation to either one of them, or one may place this part of the whole sentence even before the *fractio* or *porrectio* of the bread. He shows a considerable preference for the opinion of Pope Innocent III, which Thomas Aquinas had also rejected. Innocent's idea was that Christ might have consecrated the elements in divine power without using any words, that the words of institution were only the liturgical form which the Lord ordered for the priests' daily consecration.²² Erasmus shows here what value he attributes to the words of institution in their relation to consecration and the eucharist as such. The words have only liturgical character and by no means constitute the sacrament or the real presence.

One of the questions raised by the application of the *figura prothysteron* to the words of institution has to be: if one realigns the text, to which part of the sentence does the "This is my body" . . . "This is my blood" refer. Carlstadt answers this by not relating the "This is my body . . . and blood" to the elements. Thus Carlstadt's starting point and his interpretation of the words of institution are implicit in the Erasmian suggestion. One is not able to decide whether Carlstadt thoroughly worked over the *figura prothysteron* before announcing his theory, or whether this simply seemed the most sensible solution of the problem which the *figura prothysteron* could cause. Carlstadt's is, however, the only workable solution and example of the *figura prothysteron* thus far known.

Erasmus thus became indirectly responsible for one of the exegetical portions of Carlstadt's theology of the Supper. Melancthon was not too wrong when he blamed Erasmus for originating the struggle between Luther and Zwingli.²³ Al-

21 Clericus, 6: 716, E: Hoc est corpus meum: Fatetur Thomas fuisse, qui dicerent Christus aliis verbis consecrasset panem, prius quam porrigenis discipulis diceret, Hoc est corpus meum. Et eam opinionem meum licet refellat, non tamen vocat haeticam, cum haeticam dicat eorum qui contendebant corpus Christi non esse vere in sacramento synaxeos sed velut in signo. Et sunt qui negent Verbo Incarnato opus fuisse aliis verbis ad consecrandum. In omnibus accedendum est iudicium Ecclesiae, licet hic sermo videatur jam panem consecratum porrigenis.

22 For the relation between Erasmus and Thomas Aquinas in this problem, cf. *Summa theologiae*, III, qu. 78, I, 1, ad 1: ergo dicendum quod circa hoc est multiplex opinio ("hoc" refers here to the words of institution as *forma sacramenti*); quidam enim dixerunt, quod Christus, qui habebat potestatem excellentiae in sacramentis absque omni forma verborum hoc sacramentum perficit, et postea verba protulit, sub quibus alii postmodum consecrarent. Quod videntur sonare verba Innocentii III (4 de Sac. Alt. Myst. cap. 6) dicentis: "Sane dici potest, quod Christus virtute divina confecit, et postea formam expressit, sub qua posterius benedicerent." Sed contra hoc expresse sunt verba Evangelii, in quibus dicitur, quod Christus benedixit; quae quidem benedictio aliquibus verbis facta est.

23 Melancthon to J. Camerarius, July 26, 1529, *C. R.*, I, No. 624, 1083. Contrary to this, Erasmus himself and the humanist Bucer blame the origin of the eucharistic controversy on Carlstadt: cf. *C. R.*, 90, introduction to letter No. 41, p. 323; *Erasmii Epistolae*, ed. P. S. Allen, V, No. 1522.

though it cannot be denied that Erasmus was the source of Carlstadt's exegesis, he never could have agreed with Carlstadt's final result, the denial of the real presence. As in the case of the Erasmus-Zwingli relation, so here the disciple took a decisive step ahead of his teacher: Carlstadt negated the real presence of Christ and dissolved the Lord's Supper into symbolism. Erasmus, while touching upon symbolism, had never gone so far as to *deny* the real presence. For him, the Lord's Supper was a *mystery* which could not be explained. Christ was always mysteriously present in the eucharist.²⁴ This could not be revealed or determined, not even by the application of the words of institution to the elements, as the schoolmen did. With the *figura prothysteron*, Erasmus challenged the exegetical basis of the scholastic theology of the mass. Thus he tried to preserve the mystery of the Lord's Supper, which in his opinion was explained away by the scholastic approach to the problem.²⁵ Here Erasmus shared a tradition of the Middle Ages. The Waldensian and Bohemian Brethren are reported to have transposed certain parts of the words of institution and related them differently than in the reports of the gospels.²⁶ Thus their ideas were suspected of symbolism. In spite of this fact, it seems that they never quite reached the radical position of symbolism achieved by Zwingli and Carlstadt. At least the Bohemian Brethren were somewhat conscious of the fact that with the Lord's Supper Christ is mysteriously present.²⁷ This makes clear that during the Middle Ages there was a definite trend of thought on the Lord's Supper which was totally different from the scholastic interpretation. Humanism brought these ideas to new importance; the Reformers, under the direct influence of humanism, went even further, as we have seen with Carlstadt.

Erasmus supplied Carlstadt not only with the necessary exegetical material for his symbolism but also with the general depreciation of the "concreteness" (E. Seeberg) as a medium of divine expression. To be sure, Erasmus never denied the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. But his conception of "spirit and

24 This becomes obvious in the meanings which Erasmus attributes to the Lord's Supper and the elements. The Lord's Supper is a "sancrosanctum symbolum" (*Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum curavit I.F.S. Augustin* [Berlin, 1778], I, 258/59), "mystica coena" (II, 622), and a "mystical" act, by which the death of the Lord is constantly represented, that he may never be forgotten (III, 434, and *Werke*, ed. H. Holborn [München, 1933], 74, 4 f.). The elements are a big secret (I, 259), they are used "ad arcanæ rei repræsentationem" (III, 434). Erasmus concentrates these ideas in the "modus ineffabilis," the secret, divine way in which Christ becomes and is present in the eucharist, cf. *Clericus*, 6: 133, E; 366, F.

25 For his criticism on the scholastic approach to the eucharist, cf. *Erasmi Epistolæ*, ed. P. S. Allen, IV, No. 1039, 251 ff., and F. O. Stichart, *Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Leipzig, 1870), 80 f.

26 Barge, *op. cit.*, II, 170, quotes: Venerabilis Patris Monetae Cremonensis contra Cataros et Waldenses Lieber IV, cap. III: "Dixit Hereticus aliquando quod per Pronomen Hoc demonstravit Deus corpus proprium, intelligens sic: Acci pite materialem panem et comedite eum postea tangens corpus suum dixit. Hoc est corpus meum."—For the *Bohemian Brethren*, cf. M. Freher, *Rerum Bohemicarum antiqui scriptores* (Hannover, 1602), 263, 34-264, 42.

27 Cf. E. Peschke, *Die Theologie der böhmischen Brüder in ihrer Frühzeit*, 1, 2, 1940, 213, 3 ff. J. W. Preger in *Abhandlungen der 3. Klasse d. königlich bayr. Ak. d. Wissn.*, XIV, 2, Abt. 2, 85-87; 256, es. art. 10.

flesh"—which in the *Enchiridion* he so radically applied to life in general, religion and its manifold forms in particular—accomplished a devaluation of all external things with a resultant spiritualization. Here he agreed with Augustine, and both share the same Neoplatonic tradition.

Under the direct influence of Luther, Carlstadt turned to the study of Augustine in 1517.²⁸ E. Kähler has already demonstrated that it was during the years 1517 to 1519 that the confrontation of "spirit and flesh" became increasingly obvious in Carlstadt's theology.²⁹ According to Kähler, Augustine was Carlstadt's turning point.³⁰ Kähler does not analyze the fact that Erasmus had the same spiritualization as Carlstadt.³¹ With Kähler's result in mind, and conscious of our result that one cannot omit the Erasmian influence—at least not the exegetical—the future inquiry into the theological sources of Carlstadt has to focus on this problem: Did the study of Augustine cause Carlstadt's spiritualism, which was only supported by Erasmus and which through Tauler's influence developed into *Schwärmerei*? Or was Augustine only a catalyst, accelerating Carlstadt's *affirmation of an Erasmus-like spiritualistic tendency*, which in later years became an all-consuming passion?

28 Kähler, *op. cit.*, introduction, 3 ff.

29 Kähler, *op. cit.*, introduction, 27 ff., 40 ff., 43 f.

30 Kähler, *op. cit.*, introduction, 36, 45, 54 f.

31 Kähler, *op. cit.*, introduction, 44.

The Scriptures and the Church

BY ROBERT SCHARLEMANN

IN HIS highly interesting book, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*,¹ which appeared early in 1959, the Roman Catholic theologian George Tavad presents the interesting and challenging thesis that both the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, in their theological expositions of the relation of the church and the Scriptures in the matter of doctrinal authority, departed from the classical (and, according to Tavad, the Tridentine) view of the "coinherence" of these two "supernatural realities" (p. 245). For those who still think that Roman Catholicism today does no more than repeat its arguments against Protestantism from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and that it is utterly incapable of self-criticism, the tenor of the present book should be quite incredible. The stock Protestant arguments against Rome's position on Holy Scripture do not apply to its new theology. For this reason, if for no other, it is urgent as well as promising for Protestant theologians, and not least of all Lutheran ones, to do more than listen at the keyhole of the discussion which is now happily reaching American scholarship from Europe.

What I should like to do here is examine only a part of Tavad's work, namely, his criticism of Luther's position (Chapter VI) on Scripture and the church. Although it should be noted at the start that the book is intended as a *historical* study (pp. viii, ix) and not a systematic-theological one, nevertheless the dogmatic position of the author is quite clearly stated and is the basis of the criticism of various positions represented in the historical development.

I. HIS CRITIQUE OF LUTHER'S "PURE GOSPEL"

The Reformation doctrine of Scripture and the church is set against the background of the dilemma which had arisen in the preceding century. That dilemma resided basically in the struggle between the canonists on one end, whose "conception of papal power would consistently have led to attribute to Holy Scripture no more than a nominal value" (p. 49) because of the emphasis it laid upon "an arbitrary authority" of the pope, and on the other end the "traditional and theological conception of Scripture as the backbone of the Church's authority" (*ibid.*). According to this classical, traditional conception "Scripture contains all revealed doctrine and the Church's faith, which includes apostolic traditions, interprets it" (p. 209); that is to say, there is no opposition between Scripture and tradition, for "there is a sense in which 'Scripture alone' is an authentic expression of Catholic Christianity, inasmuch as, that is, the Scripture is, in the Church, the apostolic

¹ *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (London: Burns & Oates, 1959).

tradition and *vice versa*" (p. 11). But they had been put asunder by the fifteenth century. In that century too the "hybrid notion" of "oral tradition" appeared. And as presented by its exponent Thomas Netter Waldensis, "even if it was not worked out in all its implications, [it] held in itself a principle that was bound, sooner or later, to provoke a doctrinal Reformation" (p. 59).

Neither did the mediating evangelical position prevent the divorce of the two elements which were wedded in the classical theory. "Instead of uniting the Church and Scripture, the evangelical trend [in the fifteenth century] now set them face to face, if not in opposition" (p. 63). This divorce in theory was translated by the Lutheran Reformation into action, and "in the person of Martin Luther the cleavage between Scripture and tradition became irreconcilable" (p. 80). Instead of solving the problem by a reassertion of the oneness of church and Scripture, "the Lutheran Reformation . . . escaped from the fifteenth century dilemma through a back door" (p. 89).

Of course, when the question is posed disjunctively as "Scripture *or* the church?" any answer is bound to be wrong. But according to Tavard Luther did more than give a wrong answer by his assertion of Scripture over the church. For his primacy of the Scriptures was not in the end that at all. What he did in effect was to subordinate *both* church and Scripture to a third thing, his own doctrine of justification by faith. Thus a doctrine which was profoundly meaningful to him personally and which was clothed in Pauline and Augustinian terminology was lifted to the status of the "pure Gospel." Against the background of his personal situation—the "dilemma between temptation and wish for perfection" (p. 81)—Luther had been drawn to Augustine's utterances on the relation of faith and works and of the letter and the spirit. But in contrast to Augustine, he turned this dialectic into an "opposition" instead of a "fecundation." Departing from the Augustinian view, in which the spirit is *in* the letter and grace *in* good works, Luther equates spirit with the faith that is imputed for righteousness and he identifies the letter with precepts for good behavior. Thus instead of a continuity or mutual implication in the logic of the two, there is separation and contradiction. Work is set in opposition to faith. "The idea of man's efforts and merits *contradicts* faith in Christ's sole redeeming deeds" (p. 81, italics mine). "For all practical purposes" Luther equated justification by faith alone with the letter-condemning spirit, and the Gospel was "neither an event nor a book" but a "doctrine" (p. 82).

Moreover, the consequence of Luther's view was that for the old tradition and dogmatism was substituted a new tradition and dogmatism. "Luther's Christian is justified by faith alone. Yet this is not the whole story. For he must also hold the doctrine of justification by faith alone" (p. 83). And this finally results in a "righteousness of pure teaching" (p. 84), "a righteousness of doctrine" (p. 83). True, Luther's words appear to exalt the Scripture above all—"What else do I contend for, but to bring everyone to an understanding of the difference between the divine Scripture and human teaching or custom . . . ?"—but in reality the justified man and the doctrine of justification are set above it. Scripture and the fathers and the doctors are judged according to whether they preach Christ or

not. But preaching Christ means preaching Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone. "The biblical principle is thus soft-pedalled by Luther's separation of the Gospel as doctrine—his doctrine—and the written New Testament" (p. 84). Since the New Testament is capable of being "drawn to all sides," the criterion of what is Gospel is whether justification by faith is taught. "The subordination of doctrine to Scripture evolves into a dominion of Luther's doctrine over Scripture" (p. 84). Where formerly you may have had the tradition of the church judging Scripture, you now had the tradition of Luther judging both Scripture and the church.

Luther's interest was in "pure doctrine" over against the trappings of ecclesiastical tradition. But his definition of "pure doctrine" was ultimately a circular one and based on his individual interpretation of Scripture which led to the twofold split, first between pure doctrine and other texts of Scripture and then between the "Gospel" and the expressed faith of previous centuries. Pure doctrine was found in those passages of Scripture which in Luther's view taught justification by faith; and whatever taught justification by faith was pure Gospel. Other texts of Scripture were subordinated to that criterion. But did not Luther claim that this was the teaching of the true church in all ages, that it was more than his private opinion? Of course he did. For "having termed Christians those who agreed with his version of Christianity, Luther could affirm that all Christians stood with him" (p. 87), and "naively enough" he did not perceive that the very arguments of subjectivism which he leveled against his opponents could be equally efficient against him: anyone with a different conception of "pure Gospel" could reject Luther in precisely the terms in which he rejected others. That is to say, Luther's theology offers no non-subjectivistic standard according to which one can judge the claims of those who interpret Scripture differently from him. To answer an opponent with "the Scripture says" is not a reply at all when the controversy is between two views of what Scripture really says.

Luther's view eventuated in the "raising of a doctrine to the dignity of 'pure Gospel'" (p. 89), and even the greater balance of Melancthon did not forestall this consequence. Furthermore, as he subordinated Scripture to the doctrine of justification, he also subordinated the church to it. For the function of the church is to "distinguish the Word of God from the words of men" (p. 87, quoted from *Bab. Cap.*). That church is found not in the fathers nor the councils but in the holy Christian people. And the holy Christian people are those who—accept the pure Gospel! ("As Luther understands it," adds the author.) To put the criticism into other words, according to our author the only answer Luther can give as to what is the pure Gospel is: That which teaches justification by faith. And the only answer he can give to the further question as to why *this* is pure Gospel and not some other doctrine of Scripture is: Because I have found it to be that. With such an arbitrary founding of doctrine it could be expected, as did happen, that "the dogmatic edge of Lutheranism [became] as intransigent as that of its adversaries and more intellectualistic than the Schoolmen had ever been" (p. 89).

II. COMMENT

Tavard shows in this book as well as in his *Le Protestantisme* (Paris, 1958) a much greater sympathy with the personalities of the Reformation than the foregoing summary of his critique indicates. In fact, he entitles Chapter VI "The Glad Tidings of Dr. Luther," and there is nothing in the tone of his critique which would lead one to conclude that this title is meant ironically. They *were* glad tidings; and the inadequacies of Luther's formulation of an answer to a long-standing question does not obscure that fact. But "Luther's was a tragic fate. A man of his time, his country and his Order, he suffered like many others from a degenerate state of Church life in general and of theology in particular" (p. 88). It is Tavard's very sympathy for Luther that makes him regret the extent to which he "unsettled the age-old assumptions on which the Fathers and the Medieval Doctors had been unanimous: Holy Writ is to be taken in its integrality and the Church is inseparable therefrom" (p. 89). One cannot, therefore, blandly assume that the author would "of course" as a Roman Catholic have to find something wrong with Luther!

On the contrary, even though one who has come to share Luther's view of the eminence of "justification by faith" may feel that the book is a caricature rather than a description of Luther, nevertheless the criticism, representing as it does the most cogent of sympathetic Roman Catholic arguments against Luther's theology, lays upon us the task of saying just what it is that we are maintaining in the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone on the basis of Scripture alone. If justification by faith (I use this as an abbreviation for the fuller expression) is, as Tavard holds, a doctrine, lifted from many doctrines in Scripture and elevated to the judgeship over them all, then we seem to be hard put to answer the objection that such an elevation of a single doctrine, besides being arbitrary, robs the Scripture of its great richness. Moreover, there can be little doubt that the post-Reformation theologians in actual practice did subordinate Scripture to some doctrine or some particular interpretation which had no firmer foundation than their private convictions. For no amount of recourse to the claim that one's views were based on Scripture was able to soften the harshness and the egocentricity of the judgment of one's theological opponent. The controversies between the faculties of, say Leipzig and Jena or between the Lutherans and Calvinists are sad witnesses to this dogmatic arbitrariness.

It is hardly to be wondered at that in Roman Catholic eyes Protestantism has been a theological reed driven hither and thither by nothing more than the winds of the subjective fancies of individuals as to what the Bible *really* says. Tavard states this point with more reserve. He speaks of the "existence of several Protestant traditions" and "the paradox that they have all arisen out of the claim to follow 'Scripture alone'" (p. 246). In the face of that undeniable fact of history, is it still possible to maintain that justification by faith is the center of Scripture to which the whole gives testimony? If so, we must be able to find a profounder view of its meaning. Indeed, the Luther texts themselves require a different view.

For if it is true that you can assemble quotations to show that he understood this as *a doctrine*, it is also possible to assemble quotations to illustrate the theme of Watson's *Let God Be God*; namely, to show that this was not the statement of *a doctrine* with its own definite contents next to other doctrines with their definite contents but was rather the expression of the *limits of all doctrines*. Even though its formulation is tied to Luther's personal experience, its applicability is universal and its preeminent status is grounded in that universality.

In other words, a theological defense of justification by faith as the critical norm in and of the scriptural doctrines themselves must go further than showing the "Scripturalness" of the doctrine. Rome knows, as the Enthusiasts knew, that much already. The problem is rather to show why *this* scriptural doctrine is pre-eminent. The two traditional answers that have been given to this problem turn in a circle. The one conceives the doctrine of justification as *central* to Scripture and the other conceives it as *fundamental* to all doctrines.

The first one asserts that this doctrine is central to Scripture in the way that a certain piece of a picture puzzle may be central to the puzzle (or as a key-stone is central to an arch). Until you have placed that one piece, the puzzle makes no sense, you do not see the picture of it but only isolated pieces. Once engage that central piece, however, and all other parts become intelligible in their unity. The doctrine of justification by faith is then that piece which makes the many texts and doctrines an intelligible whole.

Now, the only thing wrong with this conception is that it does not solve any problems! If a puzzle does have such a central piece, you presuppose that anyone viewing the whole with and without the piece would agree about its centrality. And if it were the case that all devout students of the Scriptures—or at least a majority of them—would confirm the centrality of the doctrine of justification, the analogy to the picture puzzle could serve to explain its preeminence. But the dispute is precisely about the question of what *is* the central piece, if there is one. Protestant orthodoxy of the seventeenth century might have been able to satisfy itself with the answer that anyone who did *not* see the unity of the Bible in this way was either blind or malicious, preferably both. In fact, considering the tone and temper of the theological controversies of the post-Reformation period, one can understand how easy it must have been for one theologian to convince himself that his opponents were at least malicious, even where they were not stupid. But in the twentieth century it is less easy to convince oneself either of the malice of one's opponents or of the incorrigibility of one's own position.

A second answer conceives this doctrine as the most *fundamental* one. According to this view some things are more important to know *for salvation* than other things. It is more important, for example, to know that Jesus was true God than it is to know how old Methuselah was when he died, just as, if one wanted to dine, it would be more important to know where a restaurant is than to know when the Battle of Waterloo took place. Most important of all it is then to know (and, of course, believe) that one is justified by faith. It is possible to be saved without knowing explicitly who wrote Hebrews, but it is not possible to be saved without

knowing that you are saved by the faith to which God imputes righteousness. Whatever Scriptural doctrines you know in addition are either already implied in this one or are enrichments of it.

But this solution, too, does not answer the question which is raised by the incontestable fact that not all devout readers of Scripture can agree that it *does* make the justification-doctrine fundamental to salvation.

One may, of course, claim—and rightly, I think—that Tavad's own view is equally circular. He *assumes* the unity of church and Scripture, and thus any questions about the truth of this assumption he can answer only circularly. (How would one go about determining whether this unity actually exists, if one were not to assume it at the start?) However, it is not the *circularity* of a view to which Tavad makes objection (he notes that expressly in connection with his chapter on Calvin), but rather, as it were, the *smallness* of the circle. Still even here we might reply that our circle is not actually any smaller than his. Or we might reply that since we are entitled to our circles anyway, we might as well be permitted to have our small one. Some people do not *like* large circles! And if we happen to prefer to presuppose the identity of pure Gospel and the doctrine of justification by faith, who is to deny us the privilege? Who is to say that we *must* prefer symphonies to string quartets?

But such replies would make discussion pointless—except, perhaps, to make explicit the radius and circumference of our circles. They would, furthermore, miss the intention of Luther's doctrine of justification. For this doctrine intends not to set up another circle but to *break through all circles*. To find this meaning of the preeminence of that doctrine, we must proceed along a different path. We must first try to ascertain the situation in which this doctrine was effective for Luther's religious life, and then to inquire about its universal validity. If one interprets the doctrine apart from Luther's concrete situation, what results is the statement not of Luther's religious principle but rather of an ethical indifference or a new dogmatic circle based on Luther.

The starting point in understanding the elements of this doctrine can be taken in Luther's awareness of the absoluteness of the demand for moral perfection. "How do I find a gracious God?" is not a question parallel to "How do I get from Chicago to New York?" It is a religious question, and for Luther it was the question in which he was asking how to escape from the viciousness of the circle set by the moral imperative. The church's answer, which to Luther was as ultimate as the moral demand itself (both were the voice of God), amounted in fact to the answer that there *is* no way out. For God's graciousness was dependent upon that which experience testified he could not be. Who, then, would not hate the God who implants in man the unconditional desire for his mercy and at the same time makes it utterly unattainable? But Luther's discovery that the righteousness of God is the righteousness *from* God was the revelation that broke through the hopelessness of this situation.

Now, the point in this doctrine is not whether Luther *should* have felt the

moral demand and his own imperfection thus absolutely. The point is rather that he *did* and that this awareness determined the circle in which he was existentially caught. The universal element in his situation is, in other words, not the feeling of the absoluteness of the moral law and the despair at one's own imperfection but it is rather the fact that all people *can* and some people *do* encounter such situations of absolute demand and sheer despair. The universality of this situation is not its universal *actuality* but its universal *possibility*. What is universal and *actual* is that everyone does live within a circle. In Luther's case it was a moral one: if you presupposed the goodness of the works which the church imposed or counseled, then you could answer the questions raised by the moral demand. But it was precisely this presupposition which Luther could not share, even though he had found no substitute for it. This failure to share the presupposition of the circle in which one stands is a universal *possibility*, not a universal actuality.

The "superiority," then, of the doctrine of justification by faith resides not in the fact that it sets a new circle but that it is the answer which appears when all available answers fail. True, the concrete terminology, "justification," "faith not works," suggests the moral and/or legal realm only. But the moral here only exemplifies a universal which can appear in any or all realms, even in the cognitive. And when we generalize the doctrine, it has a twofold aspect. First, that you *need* not claim perfection for a moral or cognitive act or series of acts in order to have the righteousness or the truth of faith. (This is said to those who are *in fact* oppressed by the viciousness of a circle.) Secondly, that you *can* not claim perfection for them. (This is said to those who do *in fact* make a circle absolute.) This latter has in recent years received the name of "the Protestant principle."

In other words, "justification by faith" is not the doctrine which determines the Lutheran theological circle. The Scripture determines that. Thus, speaking from within the Lutheran theological circle (in which, for example, the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary is false) to someone within a Roman Catholic theological circle (in which, partly at least, this dogma is true), one cannot forthwith demand the acceptance of one's own criteria of truth. True, the dialectic of theological discussion can always hope to advance to a circle which can include opposing positions, or from which opposing positions can be judged. Indeed, in its abstract formulation, Tavard's statement of the coinherence of church and Scripture could find ready parallels among contemporary Protestant theologians and it could therefore be regarded as an advance to a unity beyond the oppositions of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. But "justification by faith" does not serve as the principle of a theological circle: it rather points to the *limits* of any circle and the overcoming of the "sting" of those limits by an acknowledgment of them; it is the generalization of that paradox of the Gospel that whoever would save his life must lose it. *Given* the actual unconditional concern for truth with its attendant anxiety at holding to something false; *given* also the commitment to a theological circle, then "justification by faith" does not add any new content or further support for the theological system. It rather exposes the limits of the

circle and breaks its strangle-hold. An unconditional concern for truth is, to be sure, no more universally *actual* than is Luther's kind of unconditional concern for moral perfection. There are many people for whom the relativity of all knowledge as well as of all moral goodness is not a particularly alarming thing—"What more could you expect, anyway?" But both are universally *possible*. The meaningfulness of the doctrine of justification by faith is, therefore, dependent on the concrete givenness of that concern: in the cognitive realm it expresses the conquest of the anxiety at the limitations of one's own knowledge ("What if I am after all wrong?"), the anxiety that comes with an unconditional concern for truth.

Herein and herein alone is the "superiority" of the doctrine of justification by faith (in whatever terms it be formulated): that it makes the absolutization of concrete goods or concrete truths (the moral and the theoretical circle) both unnecessary and impossible. Tavard's position leaves one within the circle without the possibility of breaking through it. It may even be true that the circle of Roman theology is larger than that of Lutheran theology—it certainly is true with regard to fundamentalistic Lutheranism. And as a circle it may therefore be "superior" in the sense of being richer. But it lacks the one thing needful—the freedom to transcend its own limits, the freedom expressed in the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

Book Reviews and Notices¹

The Gospel According to Thomas. Coptic Text Established and Translated by A. Guillaumont, Henri-Charles Puech, Giles Quispel, Walter Till, and Yassah 'Abd Al Masih. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 62 pages. \$2.00.

In 1946 a large collection of Gnostic manuscripts was discovered in the neighborhood of Nag Hammadi in Egypt. One of these manuscripts was the so-called Gospel of Thomas, which really is not a gospel but a collection of about 114 sayings attributed to Jesus and supposedly written by the apostle Thomas. It was discovered that the gospel contained the sayings of Jesus which Grenfell and Hunt had found at Oxyrhynchus in 1897. The text of the gospel is in Coptic interspersed with some Greek words. For the first time the entire text of the gospel is now available, together with an authoritative translation. It is being published simultaneously in five languages and in six editions. This is the greatest event in New Testament study since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

None of the 114 sayings agrees completely with the text found in the canonical gospels. In the parable of the sower, for instance, the seed fell "on the road," not "by the road," and the birds "gathered them," not "devoured them." Also the seed in the good ground bore "sixty per measure and one hundred twenty per measure." There are, of course, a number of new sayings attributed to Jesus, but many of them are clearly of Gnostic origin, or at least show the influence of Gnostic thinking.

The immense importance of this new discovery is not that it adds a few more sayings of Jesus which we had not known of before. The importance is rather that it testifies to a separate gospel tradition independent of the tradition contained in the synoptic gospels. The gospel represents a very old tradition, which was not dependent on the synoptic tradition nor had any influence on that tradition.

It is believed that the date of composition of the Gospel of Thomas was somewhere about A.D. 140 or earlier. The significance of this gospel for New Testament study will be discussed for many years to come. The repeated discoveries of these ancient manuscripts suggest the possibility that even more ancient copies of early Christian literature might be found.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. By J. T. Milik. Translated by J. Strugnell. (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 26.) Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959. 160 pages. \$2.50.

Unless one is working directly in the field of biblical research, one will have a difficult time trying to keep abreast of the flood of information concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls which continues to pour off the press. New discoveries, new translations, new theories and new revisions of old theories have continued to be made ever since the first publications appeared. Milik has here collected the most basic information which is scattered through hundreds of learned articles and technical books and summarized the history of the discoveries and findings of archeological work. He includes brief discussions of the types and contents of texts from Qumran, Murabba'at, and Khirbet Mird and develops his own theory concerning their origins and importance.

The author is a member of the international and inter-faith team of scholars which was formed seven years ago to edit the texts. He has been engaged in the major archeological expeditions and so writes with first-hand knowledge. This English edition of his work is a translation of *Dix ans de Découvertes dans le Désert de Juda* (1957), but it is a revised and expanded work

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

which includes information which had not been available in 1957.

Milik presents, besides a brief but excellent survey of the history and content of Qumran discoveries, a detailed exposition of his Essene theory. About two-thirds of the book is devoted to this subject. This theory seems to be the general trend in scroll research and the author is convincing on many points and manages to reconstruct Essene history from its supposed beginnings some time prior to the Hasideans of I Macc. 2:42 and 7:12 all the way through to the destruction of the Qumran site during the Jordan valley campaigns of the "Legio X Fretensis" and "Legio XV Apollinaris" as reported by Josephus. Many details of intertestamentary history are covered, and he presents his case by synthesizing classical, Talmudic, apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, and sectarian writings together with archeological and numismatic data.

The sheer weight of scholarship which is represented here may tend to convince the reader of the correctness of the theory. Milik himself is quite certain that the Qumranites were Essenes. "Yes, . . . this conclusion becomes inescapable, if one further compares the results of the excavations with the data found in Philo and Josephus and with the information derived from the texts found in the adjacent caves" (p. 56). He might well be correct, but there are a number of prior conclusions which lie at the base of his argument. For example, Milik places a great deal of weight on paleography to determine the chronology of the texts. This is, of course, necessary if one is to reconstruct the history of the sect, but perhaps it is questionable if a text can be dated in the "last half" or "first third" of a particular century by paleographic means. The whole science of early Hebrew paleography rested on ostraca, graffiti, lapidary inscriptions, and Aramaic papyri prior to these discoveries. To perfect the science with the very texts you are trying to date might be a questionable methodology (in spite of the Nash papyrus).

Another possibly circular technique involves the conclusions the author draws from some passages in the Habakkuk Commentary. (This text, which he dates in the first half

of the first century A.D. on the basis of the paleo-Hebrew script used for the divine name, is said to have a position, as far as paleography is concerned, which is "not quite obvious," p. 64.) According to this date, the text is quite far removed from the pre-Hasidean origins of the sect. Nevertheless, he finds in it information of the early history of the Essenes, but this information is scattered here and there throughout the *pesher*. "The apocalyptic Essene mind, especially when obliged to give a continuous exposition of a prophetic text, cannot be expected either to confine itself to the events of one period, or to separate out different events into clear groups" (p. 65). This might be very true, but this assumption could possibly lead to selecting passages which fit the theory rather than allowing the text to present an alternate hypothesis.

Any total theory presented in summary form is based on a number of specialized disciplines. The general reader is not a specialist in any field, and seldom is an author a specialist in all of them. In the second chapter, for instance, Milik discusses some textual variants of some biblical fragments and refers to certain readings which are in agreement with the Septuagint. This nomenclature is rather nebulous and seems to presuppose a standard and ancient Greek text of the Old Testament. None today (including Milik) takes at face value the story of the "seventy elders" as told in the Letter of Aristeas and other Hellenistic, Talmudic, and patristic sources. It is true that the search for the *Ur-text* continues in the wake of Lagarde's Lucianic reconstruction, but there is also a group (notably Kahle and his school) which denies that there ever was an *Ur-text*. Here again the general reader should be cautious when hearing of Septuagint readings found in scroll fragments. "Septuagint" could mean anything from Origen's hexaplaric column to Rahlfs' eclectic text.

None of these comments is meant to cast aspersions on Milik's book. This is a scholarly and carefully written work. It is only pointed out that theories which attempt to synthesize all known material always involve some leaps into lesser known fields and some dangers of possibly reasoning in a circle. Whether Milik has done the latter, this reviewer is

not in a position to say. But that he has leaned on authorities in some crucial areas is obvious. This is both necessary and justifiable, but one should be aware of the fact that the authority which is quoted or presupposed might be at loggerheads with another authority on the very point being used for support.

Milik's book is one which deserves to be chosen out of the vast field of scroll literature. It surveys an immense area of study and puts together a plausible theory which might account for all of the facts.

ROBERT W. HEFFLEY

Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. By F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959. 82 pages. \$2.50.

This book is an expansion of lectures delivered by the author at the Free University of Amsterdam and at the Universities of Utrecht and Leiden. Prof. Bruce's main task here is to clarify the methods of biblical exegesis employed by the authors of the Qumran literature. He develops his analysis around some leading motifs in the sectarian theology and concludes with a brief comparison between the methods and goals of the Qumran exegetes and some New Testament writers.

When one reads a new book on the scrolls one may first want to know what the author's position is concerning their date and historical context since whatever conclusions are drawn on these issues will inform any detailed exposition. Professor Bruce believes that the historic nucleus of the Qumran community is to be found in a band of separatists which split off from both the Hasmoneans and Pharisees after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. This group was relatively unorganized until the rise of a leader toward the end of the second century B.C. Under the guidance of this "Teacher of Righteousness" the group set itself up in the wilderness as an eschatological community under a "new covenant." ("Teacher of Righteousness," however, may have been a successive title.) The author considers the following historic identifications to be most probable: Kittim, Romans; wicked rulers, priest-kings of the Hasmonean dynasty;

Wicked Priest, Alexander Jannaeus (this, too, may have been a successive title); Seekers after Smooth Things, Pharisees; [Deme]trius (4QpNah), Demetrius III.

According to archeological findings, Khirbet Qumran had been temporarily deserted around 37 B.C. The author suggests this may have been due more to the belief that the decisive epoch had drawn near rather than to political developments in Palestine. At any rate, he maintains that the pre-37 B.C. experiences of the sect are what gave the color and direction to its exegesis.

The opening discussion concerns the *peshar* exegesis which is said to have its roots in Daniel. The mystery (*rz*; LXX and Theodotion, *mystērion*) is a divine communication given to one party, and its interpretation (*pshr*), also a divine communication, is given to another party. In the canonical book, Daniel is usually the recipient of the *pshr* (e.g., Dan. 4:9); in the Qumran texts it is the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab vii, 1-5). The Qumran commentators assumed, however, that all the words of the prophets referred to the end time, and they believed that the end time was upon them.

With these assumptions the authors of the *pesharim* atomized the biblical text so as to demonstrate its relevance for the supposed situation; they selected such textual variants as best supported their beliefs; they allegorized the text when it would not yield the desired meaning; and they removed the text from its historical context so as to reinterpret it eschatologically.

The author's analysis of the messianic import of the scrolls and the community's views of its own role in expiation and judgment in light of Isaiah's servant songs and Daniel's Son of Man figure will have particular interest to New Testament students. It might be noted that the ambiguity concerning the "servant" (whether *community* or *individual*) is also present in the Qumran literature.

The section on the Zadokite fragments is possibly the most controversial. The author bases his discussion on the fragments from the Cairo Geniza which date from the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. At the time this was written he was not aware of the Zadokite texts found at Qumran. The assumed

separation in date of a thousand years between the Qumran scrolls and the geniza manuscripts presents obvious difficulties. In any work of integrating the meaning and history of the scrolls the use of the geniza fragments becomes somewhat questionable, especially when a minor point is to be established, and most definitely when an *emendation* of the Zadokite text is condoned so as to harmonize the theological outlook of the sect. (For an example, see pp. 39, 40. As it turned out, the Cave IV manuscript of the Zadokite work *substantiated* the reading of the Cairo text on this point.)

One might also disagree with some details in the last chapter, which deals with the New Testament. Professor Bruce rightly indicates the primary differences in the points of view of the Qumran sect and the early church, but perhaps the exegetical methods of the authors of the Synoptics and those of Paul, the author of Hebrews, and the author of I Peter are more distinctly different than the author indicates.

Professor Bruce has done a scholarly work and has compressed a great deal of information and many insights into a very few pages. Despite any disagreements on details (which is to be expected in a subject such as this) the interested student will find this stimulating reading and a worthwhile addition to his own "Qumran library."

ROBERT W. HEFFLEY

The Dead Sea Community. By Kurt Schubert. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959. 178 pages. \$3.75.

This is a translation of *Die Gemeinde vom Totem Meer* (1958), the edited collection of lectures originally delivered in the faculty of Arts and Sciences of the University of Vienna in the summer of 1957. The scope of the chapters in this book is most comprehensive. Almost every relevant area of Qumran study is touched upon somewhere between the covers of this small volume.

The author states in his preface that he "desired to retain the original structure of the lectures in the printed form" and so he "incorporated quotations and other absolutely necessary references into the text and dis-

pensed with footnotes." The result is an unconfused and clear-cut discussion with no distracting elements or scholarly explanations to slow down the reader. The physical layout of chapters and sub-topics enables one, in a moment, to look up such diversified topics as "The Two Messiahs Doctrine" or "The Message of the Angels to the Shepherds of Bethlehem." Three short bibliographies are appended (one of the author's technical works) as well as an index of references to biblical, apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, Qumran, ancient, Talmudic, and Midrashic writings.

In some respects this is a difficult book to appraise. One gets the impression—in too many instances—that the author's desire to keep the text untrammelled with scholarly adiaaphora has led to gross oversimplification. There are Qumran texts that are bristling with difficulties for the translator and exegete, but little of this shines through these pages. There are problems with the Essene theory in relation to Pliny, Philo, and Josephus, but these are summarily dismissed by pointing to the misunderstanding of Hellenizing tendencies of the ancient authors. There are problems concerning the *Weltanschauung* of the Hasideans of I Maccabees, but they are resolved with apparent finality in four pages. There are problems with the supposed relation between the Qumran texts and the New Testament which may never be resolved, but very definite conclusions are set forth here. For example, "... one of the most important results of Qumran research has been to prove the Jewish origin of the Gospel of John conclusively" (p. 152); "... in the Johannine literature we have a Christian addressing himself to Essene teachings" (p. 154); "... the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews was concerned to prove that in Jesus all three messianic aspects of the Qumran doctrine of the Messiah are united" (p. 159), etc. In short, a careful reading will leave many questions unanswered. When lectures are delivered, one usually has a question period to resolve the generalities; when they are printed essentially as they were delivered, the reader has nowhere to go—but to the texts themselves.

When one reads exegetical books on the scrolls it would be well if one had scroll

facsimiles at hand—or at least alternate translations—before agreeing with everything one reads. For example, the added “s” to “Messiah” on p. 116 in a reference to *Zadokite Admonitions* 8:21b, where the *Hebrew* text is singular; *ebylene chesed* of IQHod 5:22 translated “poor of grace, poor by grace” (p. 86), perhaps an odd translation of the construct state but a convenient one for his exegesis of Matt. 5:3 (pp. 137, 138); the inclusion of Mark 1:8 in a reference to baptism “with fire” and the general conclusion concerning Qumran judgment by fire (p. 129). There are many technical points such as these that a careful reading will raise.

The relation of the scrolls to early Judaism and to the New Testament is not a light matter. In this particular book the author maintains that these texts have “extraordinarily great significance . . . for the religious and historical understanding of the New Testament” (p. 122). If an author is writing from that point of view, a reader should follow his arguments carefully, check his sources, and weigh his conclusions before repeating them *ex cathedra*.

Professor Schubert relies primarily on Cave I texts, a few Cave IV fragments, the *Zadokite* fragments (the Cairo texts), and relevant excerpts from the pseudepigrapha for the development of his theses. The greater part of the material is, of course, still unpublished. (It has been estimated that there will be at least ten volumes of texts in the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* series before all of the now available texts are published.) The author’s synthesis of the presently available texts is carefully done. As he said, the book represents ten years of labor; this is no “hack” book on the scrolls. Nevertheless, the summary fashion in which he writes tends to oversimplification.

As was said before, this is a book which is, in some respects, difficult to appraise. It is not a popular book, and it is not a book which bears the scars of a scholarly dissertation. It is a scholar’s reconstruction of Qumranology printed in popular format. Thus it carries the virtues and faults of both types.

ROBERT W. HEFFLEY

The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. By Cecil Roth. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1959. 85 pages. \$4.75.

This study by Cecil Roth is an interpretation of the evidence in the light of the turbulent historical situation in Palestine from the rise of Herod (c. 45 B.C.) to the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). This period of Palestine’s history is one of social and political turbulence, and of violence and revolt. Perhaps the most revolutionary of all parties was the Zealots, a group characterized as reformist, apocalyptic, and nationalistic. It is in this group that Roth finds the clue to the identity of the people of the Qumran community, to persons and groups mentioned in the scrolls, and to the dating of several important writings in the group.

Josephus, who has long been recognized as an important source of information about the period, continues to be a primary source, but Roth reads him with the same awareness of the need for critical evaluation that must be applied to all historical source material. Josephus certainly was not unbiased.

The book develops a not commonly accepted point of view but it is argued uncommonly well. Its general position is similar to that advocated by G. R. Driver. What, then, are some of the features of this position?

The key documents, according to Roth, are the “Manual of Discipline,” which may come from the formative period of the sect’s history under Judah ben Hezekiah some time after A.D. 6, the “Habakkuk Commentary,” and the “War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness,” which comes from the apocalyptic time of the revolt and the fall of Jerusalem. Josephus repeatedly refers to the Zealot leaders as “sophists,” and this is not inconsistent with the group’s interest in study and comment upon the Scriptures.

The events which explain the writing and meaning of these apocalyptic commentaries (*peser*) are those of the decade A.D. 60-70. The *peser* is neither strictly a commentary nor a midrash but “the inspired application of the terms of the biblical prophecies to the ‘End of Days’ which had already begun.”

This dating enables Roth to suggest the identity of certain groups and persons about whom there has been considerable discussion

but little agreement. For instance, the "Teacher of Righteousness" is either Menahem ben Judah or his successor Eleazar ben Jair, both of whom were leaders of the group in the days of the revolt. The "Wicked Priest" would be the Pharisee leader Eleazar ben Hananiah. The "Kittim," then, are the Romans, and the "Makers of Smooth Interpretations" are the Pharisees.

Also, according to Roth, the Qumran "monastery" which was destroyed by an earthquake in 31 B.C. may have been occupied till then by Essenes, but the group who re-occupied it about A.D. 6 were not Essenes but Zealots. Closely associated with the Qumran group were the Sicarii (an activist Zealot group) who controlled the nearby fortress of Masadah from about A.D. 66 to 73.

What are the implications of the position here set forth? If Roth's dating is correct, there is no possibility of influence from the group, especially of its later writings, on John the Baptist, on Jesus, or on the early church. However, it still may be used to shed light on one of the movements current in New Testament Palestine. It is also a reminder that the history of Palestine is considerably more turbulent than is commonly believed. One wonders why there is not more reflection of it in the New Testament.

The explanation of the *peser* as an application to current events of prophetic Scripture has implications for the use of the Old Testament by the preachers and writers of the New.

Roth's study also sheds additional light on the reasons for, and character of, apocalypticism. It is helpful to realize how closely such writing is related to, and involved in, the events that called it forth. It does mean, however, that some of the scrolls must have been deposited almost immediately after being written. The last troubled times of the sect must have been a stimulus to considerable writing.

A study such as this is valuable. It demonstrates again the importance of the historical factor in interpreting the questions raised by the scrolls. Also, it re-examines theories that may come to be regarded as conclusions if they are repeated often enough. It is well, in the case of the scrolls, when so much

material still awaits publication and so much study of it still needs to be done, to consider every possibility and to promote an openness to new evidence and to new interpretations of it. The book deserves a wider reading than its high price (85 pages, \$4.75) will encourage.

HARRY J. MUMM

The Mind of St. Paul. By William Barclay. New York: Harper, 1959. 256 pages. \$3.50.

In something less than 250 pages the author takes his readers on a stimulating guided tour of the thought-world of the apostle Paul, Christianity's most outstanding theologian and largest contributor to the literature of the New Testament.

What Paul thought on a number of subjects, such as God, the incarnation, the death of Christ, faith, the Holy Spirit, flesh, the second coming, and the church, is presented in eighteen brief chapters.

To the average reader the simplicity and clear organization of the material will be welcome. Most of the chapters are neatly divided into specific points with a summary at the end.

For example, the chapter on the call of God has a series of paragraphs, each adding another feature. We learn that it is a call to salvation, then to holiness, then to peace, then to grace, then to fellowship with Christ, and then to share the kingdom and glory of Christ.

If this has sermonic overtones, it must be recognized that Barclay intends it. Originally all but two of the chapters appeared as articles in *The British Weekly*. They are a form of religious journalism, and popular in a good sense of the word.

The author employs a style that has already won a wide reading public with such books as his *A New Testament Wordbook* and *More New Testament Words*. His pages are bright with lucid illustrations and sparkling facts. Much of his material will be useful to the builder of sermons as well as to his listeners. Used rightly, it can be a real aid to the pastor.

Of course, the serial manner in which the parts of the book were first published resulted in some limitations. By no means all

of Paul's thought appears. In many places Pauline scholars will wish that the treatment had been more detailed. It will be felt that some positions are inconsistent, and that assertion sometimes takes the place of carefully groomed evidence. There are places where technically inaccurate statements may be found. A case in point is the assertion that "Greek verbs which end in *-oun* do not mean to make a person something; they mean to treat, to reckon, to account a man as being something." This simply does not do justice to the causative idea of that suffix.

However, Barclay has by no means neglected the weightier matters of Paul's thought-world. He has made available for literate but non-specialist readers a valuable aid to understanding much of the teachings of the great, and often misunderstood, apostle to the Gentiles. Too often the experts make Paul obscure and remote. They interpret Paul with the effect of complexity, while Barclay interprets him in the direction of simplicity.

Take as a concluding example his remarks about Paul's ideas on the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Son. "To speak of the pre-existence of the Son is to say that God did not begin to redeem men when Jesus Christ came into this world, but that throughout all ages the redeeming power and the sacrificial work of God had been at work. To speak of the pre-existence of the Son means that the Love which was demonstrated on Calvary is an eternal movement of the heart of God to man."

Barclay's work has already proven helpful to a large reading public. This book should continue to serve well an expanding circle of Christians eager to know more of their Bible and their faith.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

The Prophets of Israel. By C. Ross Milley.
New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
143 pages. \$3.75.

The author, minister of the First Congregational Church, West Haven, Connecticut, says he "does not assume to have written anything startlingly new" but that he will be well rewarded if "even a few people read again the message of the prophets, and

sense their profound importance to our religious heritage."

The religious heritage is traced as a "climb, not by decisive revolutionary steps, but by a gradual ascent." With some help from Albrecht Alt, the beginnings are traced to the patriarchs, who "practiced El cults of their own, preserving in them distinctive characteristics of their former cults but at the same time adjusting themselves to much that was Canaanitic." The unique experience of the Fathers was the fact that in each case the deity had *freely chosen* to make himself known.

Though it is not quite clear whether ethics originated with the Mosaic covenant (p. 27) or with Elijah (p. 26), morality was the emphasis of the eighth century prophets. These, together with the seventh century prophets, are treated in one of the two major chapters under a title concerned with their attitude toward the cult. Though they did not oppose the cult *per se*, they showed it was meaningless in the absence of faith and justice. It remained for Deuteronomy to weld ritual to the teachings of the prophets.

The other major chapter considers the development of monotheism. After pointedly disagreeing with W. F. Albright for tracing monotheism back to Moses, Dr. Milley follows others in assigning the accomplishment to Deutero-Isaiah. Even here there is room for reservations. "While we may think of the message of this prophet as monotheistic, yet that word is inadequate. The prophet attempts no systematic reasoning about God but speaks simply that which God had disclosed to him." Yet Deutero-Isaiah is called the "first deliberate monotheist" and "the climax of the evolution of Israelitic religion." The summary at the end of the book confuses the issue, however, by speaking of the writer of Deuteronomy as presenting in 6:4 the "highest monotheistic achievement of Israel."

It can be seen that the author has followed the line of Old Testament study established some decades ago and has not altered his approach according to some more recent trends. Documentation throughout the book refers to many of the standard textbooks but most consistently shows a dependence on Pfeiffer's *Introduction to the Old Testament*.

Yet the book attains its purpose by reviewing most of the themes of the prophetic message.

ROBERT J. MARSHALL

A Christian Theology of the Old Testament.

By George A. F. Knight. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959. 380 pages. \$5.00.

What does the Old Testament mean for Christianity? To the various answers offered through the centuries since Christ, this book adds another. It is not, of course, a completely new one. The author himself does not present it as such. Rather he tries to put the meaning of the Old Testament into terms that will speak to our day. And he is quite aware that future generations will have to do the job again to meet the needs of their times.

Whatever new contribution Knight may have to present lies in his organization of Old Testament experience into a scheme of five "moments." Ordinarily we recognize three such "moments" in the span of an individual life: birth, marriage, and death. To these Knight adds two which Israel knew: resurrection and a final Day of the Lord.

As seen in Israel's history, the first moment was the birth of the nation in Egypt. God of his own will and desire adopted Israel as the son of his love and brought him forth to be his own. The marriage experience came at Sinai when Israel (now "she") became the bride of Yahweh, bound to him by the covenant. Death struck in 587 B.C. At that time Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon destroyed the temple and the capital, Jerusalem, and brought the reign of David's dynasty to an end. The fourth moment is linked with the liberation of the captives by Cyrus of Persia, 538 B.C. Their return to the homeland was a resurrection to new life. But the full coming of the Day of the Lord was delayed, so that the fifth moment lies ahead in the future.

Having thus summed up the Old Testament in its "wholeness" (by which Knight means not at all its entirety but rather its central message), he proceeds to show that the New Testament displays an identical pattern. The relationship between the two

is not so much that of prophecy and fulfillment. The Old Testament is not simply the forerunner of the New Testament. This teaches us that God "works in the same way, and toward the same ends, at all periods in the history of man" (p. 214). From time to time Knight speaks of an underlying theme of death and resurrection running throughout the Old Testament. But he does not develop this consistently.

So far as the formal division of the text is concerned, the arrangement is rather conventional. The four parts are entitled (1) God, (2) God and creation, (3) God and Israel, (4) the zeal of the Lord. Within these sections the thought is not well integrated. Often the material is fragmentary and puzzlingly incoherent. Much worthwhile information is included, but the book lacks the careful organization and integrated outlook of a truly scientific theology.

Granted, the results of literary criticism are regularly called into account. And the author conscientiously employs them, as when he refers to the "quasi-historical twelfth chapter of Genesis." But instead of being controlled by the progression of history as it affects the Old Testament writings, in instances of crucial importance, Knight explicitly ignores historical contexts.

The result of this is that when Knight is building up his structure of the five moments, he picks and chooses pretty much at will in order to find what he wants to support his positions. He gives his own account of this process in the following words: "We notice that random texts or passages taken from the Old Testament itself, and possibly written at widely different periods of Israel's story, often most surprisingly agree in their general interpretation, provided they are seen in the light of the Old Testament revelation as a whole" (p. 9).

Perhaps the most serious weaknesses in the book is the basic dependence upon typology. Knight, typically it seems, both defends and denies his use of it. On the one hand he says that St. Paul and the author of the P documents as well as other Old Testament writers used this method of dealing with history, and "if this is considered to be typology, then typology is a legitimate method of interpretation." Yet on the other

hand he declares "if we, traveling by another road than St. Paul, discover in the story of the People of God five 'moments' which can be paralleled by five similar moments in the story of Christ, we are not thereby necessarily indulging in typology at all" (p. 217).

In fairness we should examine an example of Knight's method to see whether it displays typology. Writing on the fall of Jerusalem as the act of God, he quotes Isa. 1:6, "From the sole of the foot unto the head there is no soundness in it." He interprets: "In what? In the Body of the Son, in the Body of the Bride of that God who is the utterly pure, utterly righteous, utterly holy, utterly transcendent God, the Maker of the heavens and the earth!" Later, he refers again to this theme, saying "We have seen that the Body of Israel, the Bride of God, is one day to be united as one flesh with her divine Husband. Such an expectancy was surely actualized in the event which we call the Incarnation. There we see the validity of the Old Testament image of the union of the divine and the human as one flesh" (p. 351). Can this be called historical exegesis?

In fact if not in theory, Knight operates as did early Christian typologists. From the standpoint of Christian theology he looks back into the Old Testament and sees there a pre-incarnation of New Testament revelation. Typology is just that method whereby the Old Testament was saved for Christian theology at the expense of historical exegesis.

Using a sort of reverse twist, Knight takes New Testament words and ideas back into the Old Testament and plants them there. For instance, he comments of Ps. 16:10 that "the living and holy God has imputed to him his own righteousness" (p. 262). Again, "In giving his name, God put himself in total humility into Moses' hands, that in a sense which is certainly no exaggeration of language, God 'emptied himself' before Moses, his sinful creature" (p. 44). There are many such cases.

A number of good things should be said too. The book displays a wide range of reading among contemporaries of many backgrounds. The presentation is quite straight-

forward. There is an appeal to the experience of the reader which invites his involvement in the relationships described in terms of the past. And the author has determinedly kept his English pitched at a frequency suitable to the non-technical reader.

A closing observation has to do with the fact that there is no bibliography included. Despite the lack of a formal list of books consulted or mentioned, it seems apparent that the most influential in point of method seem to have been Pedersen and Engnell of the Scandinavians, Wilhelm Vischer of Switzerland, and the English A. G. Hebert.

HOWARD N. BREAM

Essentials in Christian Faith. By J. B. Harrington. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 299 pages. \$4.00.

Whether inadvertently or not, it turns out that Mr. Harrington's *Essentials in Christian Faith* illustrates Tillich's "method of correlation," i.e., of showing that the human questions that grow out of man's existential situation receive their appropriate answers in the biblical and Christian revelation. I consider this book the best of numerous recent texts designed to teach the essentials of the Christian faith on the college level. Since philosophic reflection arises out of life-situations and the search for meaning, and since the Christian gospel addresses itself to man's life-situation, it is artificial and impossible for the Christian to separate the fields of philosophy and religion into mutually exclusive territories. Moreover, if we pertinaciously adhere to the insights of biblical *theism* (which rejects a *totally* transcendent God), it cannot be claimed that God is *not* involved in man's attempt to understand his creation through the philosophic and scientific enterprises. Christian faith, for the man of today, bitten as he is by the "acids of modernity," must necessarily exhibit its consistency with, and orientation toward, both philosophic and scientific insights and the world-views these tend to support. This is one of the merits of this book.

Theologically Mr. Harrington's position in this text is that of "ecumenical orthodoxy." More and more it is apparent that such a theology exists as the common faith of modern Protestantism as represented by

the major denominations. This modern "ecumenical orthodoxy," having thrown off the shackles of literal biblicism, fundamentalism, and dogmatic rationalism, is proving that it is possible to preserve continuity with the evangelical essence of historic Christianity without repudiating accredited science or a critical methodology. I am certain that no other form of Christianity has any future, and that this development, too, is part of that guidance of the Spirit into truth which Christ promised the church.

On specific doctrines Mr. Harrington's positions are frequently not definitive. He shows, on the one hand, what the gospel intends and irreducibly proclaims as God's redemptive activity in history. On the other hand, he shows that in attempting to understand the divine *modus operandi* (how the eternal acts in and through the temporal, the creaturely, the historical), newer views are possible that may enrich or supersede the classic doctrines of our forefathers. In general, it is noticeable that newer theological interpretations attempt to work out more thoroughly the implications of *personalistic categories* rather than the predominant metaphysical and impersonal categories of Hellenistic heritage. This may be observed in the discussion of the "person of Christ," the "Trinity," the "incarnation," the "atonement," and so forth. Personally, I feel that introducing the college student to *living* theological reflection in this way rather than confronting him with a denominationally congealed system of official dogma is most wholesome. If this procedure tends to dissolve denominational rigidity and exclusiveness and to some degree favors the trend toward ecumenical orthodoxy, would this be deplorable? Though this text is not specifically Lutheran, it contains much that intelligent Lutherans believe or reflect on. Hence I can recommend it as an excellent textbook for college classes.

W. O. DOESCHER

Heaven in the Christian Tradition. By Ulrich Simon. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 310 pages. \$6.00.

Several books dealing in particular with New Testament theology have appeared re-

cently which were constructed around some subject in the New Testament such as the Resurrection or the Kingdom of God. The work here reviewed is similar, although its scope is broader. It is a study essentially of a single biblical concept—heaven—which pulls into orbit about it many other aspects of Old and New Testament theology.

An excellent first chapter is an historical survey of the place heaven and the concept of it have had in the thinking, literature, and theology of all men from the most ancient times until now. Herein Simon traces the shift in the treatment of heaven from its original and influential position as a purely religious concept to its secularization in later literature and philosophies, and finally (in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) to its decline into near oblivion among modern theologians.

The rest of the book deals with the biblical theology of heaven itself and is introduced by a chapter (with a somewhat misleading title) which defines biblically the term. Succeding chapters bring other biblical subjects—God, angelology, Satan and demonic powers, God's struggle with and victory over evil, life in the age to come, and Hebrew and Christian worship—into the analysis of the concept of heaven. The main subject of the study quite naturally limits the scope of treatment given these other subjects and colors it, with the result that one may not always agree with conclusions drawn from the peculiar approach taken. Sometimes important issues, necessary for a complete picture of the biblical view on a particular matter, are neglected, as for example, in the handling of the material on the Lord's Supper (pp. 275 ff.), where the emphasis is upon the heaven-related aspect of the sacrament while its connection with the past event of Christ's death and resurrection in which the recipient participates is hardly mentioned.

Nevertheless, there is a great deal of objectivity here. The book is rich in scholarship and research, but it is a work which will appeal primarily to the specialist. The results of the writer's study, his conclusions and findings, are woven together tightly so that the book does not read easily. The pastor and student (unless he is involved in a project of research related to the subject

investigated here or has a rare interest in every avenue of biblical studies) would probably not be interested in a book so technical as this. Still the study is valuable and may well aid in re-opening an interest in the now largely neglected teaching, an interest one might expect to be further developed at this present time when biblical theology generally is receiving so much renewed attention.

ROBERT A. BARTELS

Faith of Our Fathers. By Walter J. Kukkonen. New York: The American Press, 1959. 203 pages. \$3.00.

In the light of its contents, the title of this book can be understood as embracing a number of objectives, all of which are inter-related—first, to show that the interpretation of the Evangelical Lutheran faith as held by the Suomi Synod is in harmony with the interpretation of their fathers, the Lutheran Church of Finland; second, to demonstrate that the understanding of the Gospel taught by the Church of Finland is the same as that held by their fathers, the Lutheran Reformers of the sixteenth century; and, third, to make clear that the presentation of the faith made by the Reformation period is none other than that of the writers of the ecumenical creeds which themselves claim to be the true exposition of the Holy Scriptures.

One of the real dangers in all merger movements is that of the failure on the part of the smaller bodies to make the contribution to the larger whole of which they are capable—whether the responsibility for this failure lies with the larger body or the smaller body itself. The larger whole is surely the poorer when the best of the heritage of the merging parts does not find its place in the new! The appearance of this volume is a conscious attempt on the part of the author to make articulate the faith as understood by the rock from which his group is hewn. Dr. Kukkonen's work is all the more to be appreciated because it makes available in English what would otherwise be inaccessible to most of us if it were only to be found in his mother tongue.

The central thread in the nine units of the book is a description of what the Creator God has done not only to bring his rebellious creature back into right relationship with

himself but also to maintain him in the restored relationship and to spell out the ethical implications of the New Creation. All this is done in a style that has the ability continually to stab the reader awake and with a forthrightness and frankness which reflects the shameless sobriety of Finnish piety. That the writer is not just a reporter but a creative interpreter in his own right is evident from the way in which he is able to marshal and to present his materials. This is an excellent handbook for instruction in the evangelical understanding of the Gospel.

We all owe Dr. Kukkonen a debt of gratitude for this labor of love. Who follows in his train?

GEORGE AUS

The Classic Christian Faith. By Edgar Carlson. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1959. 171 pages. \$2.75.

This book contains a series of fifty-two chapel meditations delivered at Gustavus Adolphus College by President Edgar Carlson. They follow the five parts of Luther's Small Catechism, eleven on the Commandments, nineteen on the Apostles' Creed, nine on the Lord's Supper, and three on the sacraments. Each meditation is about three printed pages long.

Here is excellent supplementary reading, if not the textbook itself, for the adult confirmation class. In his own characteristic way President Carlson presents his material in such a lucid, provocative, and persuasive manner that the insights stay with one long after the book has been laid down. His positive approach to the Commandments will give those who read a new appreciation of the place and function of the will of God in the life of man. The rich and varied insights with which the meditations on the Creed are replete open up for one new and grand vistas of the faith, while the meditations on the Lord's prayer oblige one to reexamine one's own life of communion to discern where it has fallen short and how it can become more meaningful.

This little book is an endeavor to present the Christian faith in as winsome and cogent a way as possible. The winsomeness, however, is not just for the sake of being winsome but for the sake of the truth, for there

are a number of places in the volume where the author finds himself having to say, "win-some or not winsome, this is the faith."

The pastor and teacher will find the insights of this book a significant source of enrichment. The reading layman will find it stimulating, edifying, provocative.

It must be assuring to the folks "back home" to know that this is the kind of diet their young people are receiving in the college chapel.

GEORGE AUS

Great Phrases of the Christian Language.

By Roger L. Shinn et al. Philadelphia: The United Church Press, 1958. 121 pages. \$2.00.

This helpful little volume presents the efforts of seven American scholars and churchmen to deal meditatively and devotionally with a number of the oft-used and significant words and phrases of the Christian faith. Roger L. Shinn writes on "To Magnify His Holy Name," Truman B. Douglass on "The Holy Church Throughout the World," Daniel Day Williams on "The Love of God," Fred Hoskins on "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ," James E. Wagner on "Christ Died for All Men," Roger Hazelton on "The Communion of the Holy Spirit," and Robert V. Moss on "The Life Everlasting."

Each of the chapters opens with appropriate readings of Scripture and closes with a prayer, new or old, all of which are uniformly distinctive in beauty and meaning.

Christian laymen, especially, will find this book useful for its freshness and reverence in dealing with ideas which, though basic to the Christian faith, tend to become stale and dulled by being overworked. Further, one might suggest its evangelistic possibilities in introducing one's neighbor to the treasures of the Christian faith.

FRANCIS E. REINBERGER

Theology of Culture. By Paul Tillich. Ed. by Robert C. Kimball. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. 214 pages. \$4.00.

"In abbreviation," Tillich writes, "religion is the substance of culture, culture is the form of religion" (p. 42). This new volume, *Theology of Culture*, made up of fifteen

essays, fourteen of which have been previously published (from 1940 to 1957), hovers rather steadily over the culture-religion territory. An earlier book, *The Protestant Era* (1948), also a collection of articles, many dating from Tillich's European days, were more strictly academic and even more abstract. The problem in that collection seemed to be roughly blocked out by the relations between philosophy and theology, with cultural issues somewhat less pronounced; the themes in the newer collection are dominantly broad cultural issues and how these can be construed theologically, and the technical issues are accordingly somewhat less manifest.

Another Tillich book can hardly fail to be an event of some sort. For one thing, it is handy to have in one compass so many of the essays to which students and scholars continue to refer. Thus we get his short history of existential philosophy and his discussion about the two types of religious philosophy (Chapters VII and II); also we find here that interesting and partly autobiographical piece, "The Conquest of Intellectual Provincialism: Europe and America," which continues Tillich's life story through his American days. It also compares European and American scholarship very candidly. Another pleasantness of this book is, however, its very plainness. Tillich in short pieces is Tillich more intelligible. For some reason, Tillich's long books, e.g., his two volumes of *Systematic Theology*, seem increasingly to disguise his problems. He tends to make up as he goes the referents by which he adjudicates his concerns, and woe betide both the wary and the unwary reader! However, in his articles, as in his sermons, the very concreteness of his problems—the church-supported school (Chapter XI), Einstein's views about God (IX), psychoanalysis (VIII), Buber's views (XIV), communicating the Gospel (XV)—even this specificity helps considerably. Therefore, I believe this book is a most excellent introduction to Tillich's theology. This still leaves open the question whether this theology ought to claim anyone but Tillich.

The large themes are here too: religion is ultimate concern; sin is estrangement from man's "own ground and depth"; man is

"immediately aware of something unconditional"; that there is a question "implied in man's very existence" which the church has the function of answering; how God is both symbolic and yet non-symbolic; the theological bearing of art, psychoanalysis, and existentialism; etc. All of these and more are conceived by Tillich to be relevant to religion and especially to Protestantism. Traditional theology is refashioned, and Christianity is seen to play a role in something vast, something transcendental, deep, spiritual, and even ontological.

One cannot help noting that Tillich is still firmly in the grasp of the speculative philosophical traditions. Most of his problems are discovered apparently in his reading. He wants to put the talk, the expressions, the cultures of people into congruence. He takes all of them terribly seriously and never stops to ask whether he ought to be burdened with them. Furthermore, he does not ask whether they are sensible in the first place or what specific problem they really try to resolve. Instead he speculates about the problems of "man," and it is on behalf of "man" in general that he causes the literature, art, philosophy, and theology to devolve. This is why his existentialism seems to me to be so ridiculous, for it prejudices every existing man as much as any metaphysical philosophy or theology possibly could.

This book ought to stir up the biblical scholars and the theologians, certainly the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Catholics, to some fundamental debate. To this date most of them appear to be intimidated, and this is understandable enough. I can hardly believe that they are really convinced. Surely Tillich's reflections are only thickly disguised versions of views that were previously shown to be unbiblical and, at best, expressions of natural piety. That they should be projected now as distinctively Protestant, an improvement upon St. Thomas, and even as an expression of biblical faith, seems to me to make Tillich a sitting duck. Biblical scholarship is delightfully acute these days, and Protestants and Catholics are not (uniformly, at least) theologically illiterate. Maybe Tillich's books, this one included, will have that dubious kind of "dialectical" significance of which he has

written—of vanquishing Tillich too!

PAUL L. HOLMER

Faith and Community. By Clyde A. Holbrook. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 159 pages. \$3.00.

Professor Clyde Holbrook's book comes out of a good number of years of reading and teaching the theological themes of Protestant Christendom. Its six chapters, divided four to two over "Faith and Personal Existence" and "Christian Faith and the Moral Life," are fraught with twentieth-century theological learning, sufficient, one might add, to give a reader a kind of orientation in contemporary sophisticated talk about God and man. And this latter still seems to be a widely espoused goal and a sign of seriousness, sobriety, and sound Christian faith. If one subscribes to such a notion I suppose this book might be rather helpful, for its pages are, as the author tells us, the consequent of "an internal dialogue with many viewpoints," among others, Augustine's, Buber's, H. R. Niebuhr's, Whitehead's, Bultmann's, Tillich's, Kant's, and only God and Holbrook know how many besides.

The major difficulty of this book belongs really not to it alone but to an entire genre or class of scholarly books. The author lets both his problems and their resolutions be stated by the authorities. The scope becomes larger and terribly complex as the pages go by. Finally one gets the impression from reading that the problem generating this book was either in another book or somewhere between the other books. And what started out as a familiar, circumspect issue, with which one thought he had an intimate first-hand relation, subsequently is transmuted into an array of problems, all of them learned-sounding and with which one can have only the most indirect and third-hand relation. Thus this work, like many books on ethics which begin with concrete issues and end up with Kant versus Mill again, starts with questions ostensibly close to at least the author and ends up with a fabrication of learning. It seems to me that such books help make a farce out of learning by rendering some genuine questions artificial; but, in this particular instance, such a way of writing betrays Professor Holbrook, who is a man

of integrity, passion, and wit. All of these personal attributes get so refracted in this book that their effect is almost negligible. And these, after all, are what matter eminently!

Furthermore, with contemporary theological interests, there has come a marked profusion of concerns. One of them can be stated broadly as "What shall I think when so many theologians think so many different things?" Professor Holbrook takes all the big shots very seriously indeed. He seems to have read anybody who matters at all. One might suppose that an immense advantage for a reflective Christian today is that you can find at least one authority for every persuasion. But the persistent reader is worse off, for he finds several varying authorities on every topic, and the problems keep growing as the reading progresses.

Professor Holbrook's crucial questions do not seem very crucial to me. He evidently wants to know something about what is required if he is going to be faithful to Jesus; and then he wants to know how he should comport himself towards others—the community (if a fashionable word might be used!). I keep wondering just what the problem really is. Does Holbrook read the Scriptures? Does he go to church? Does he say his prayers? What more does he want? Or, doesn't he want that? And, why turn to the theologians with such aching earnestness? This seems as absurd as a man who is trying to be good turning in desperation to the moral theorist, or the man who needs a drink slaking his thirst with the chemist's account of water.

Theologians in their hour of prosperity need to take a good look at these supposed problems. I am not certain which of them are real problems and which of them have come about through our proneness to plausible talking. Theologians, too, have cause for concern when their ruminations become popular. Jesus' words might apply here too: "Woe unto you when men speak well of you."

PAUL L. HOLMER

The Gift of Conversion. By Erik Routley. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959. 140 pages. \$2.50.

Erik Routley, chaplain of Mansfield Col-

lege, Oxford, approaches this excellent study of conversion in a case study of Paul, Augustine, and Wesley. He does this because our thinking about conversion is cluttered up by strange and fixed notions. He finds that there is a great variety in conversion experiences, and he finds the common trait, which these men have found to be freedom, freedom from something, and freedom under something.

He follows the case study with a biblical study, particularly Galatians 5, and ends with "systematic" analysis. His basic approach is clearly evangelical, insisting that conversion is a gift through the Holy Spirit which takes its pattern from the death and resurrection of Christ and from which no merit accrues in any way.

What follows conversion, commonly called sanctification, is described with refreshing difference. Conversion itself is spoken of ontologically, or as a change of Being, and the change is described not only as a release but as a change from anxiety to assurance and courage. In sharply provocative style he argues against continued dependence on (1) the preacher of conversion, (2) the Bible, using distortion and legalism, and (3) upon God—in the wrong way. He urges staunch and courageous assertion, which he calls "dogmatism," and this is again refreshing, even though he closes the communion door to dissenters.

It is a delightful experience to read Routley, although the rather concentrated style makes it necessary to work with the author. "Sacred cows" are treated with something less than respect, but a strong and positive case is made in each instance. I recommend the book, especially for those who need renewal or clarification of their thinking in this area.

J. KNUDSEN

The World and Men Around Luther. By Walter G. Tillmanns. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. 384 pages. \$5.95.

This book by Professor Tillmanns, of Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, is a helpful addition to the growing Reformation literature in America. Part One is a brief

(66 pages) but adequate discussion of "The World Around Luther." This includes a presentation of the religious and political situation at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Part Two, which is the significant section of the book both as to content and length (270 pages), deals with "The Men Around Luther." Here for the first time, in English at least, is a pulling together of biographical sketches of persons who played significant roles in the Reformation period. Some of these were Luther's friends and helpers; others were his enemies; still others were actors in the drama of the sixteenth century without being sharply aligned for or against the Reformer. A few of the chapter headings in this section will indicate the author's treatment of this important aspect of the Reformation: The Inner Circle (here one will find Amsdorf, Bugenhagen, Melancthon, et al.); The Larger Circle (Saxons, Brandenburgers, Silesians, and Hessians; Roerer, Dietrich, Flacius, and many others); Lutheran Laymen (for example, the printers, artists, and the knights); Scandinavian Lutherans (Tausen, the Petris, Agricola, et al.); English Friends and Foes; Other Movements; and the Roman Camp.

There are many values that a book like this has. Not least is the fact that it provides a handy reference for both student and teacher in Reformation studies. What was formerly hidden away in encyclopedias and monographs is now made accessible in one volume. Moreover, the book is fairly well documented. One notes, however, that aside from citation of Luther's correspondence, the sources are largely secondary. The extensive bibliography would have been more helpful had it been annotated. Two indexes are included, a general index to Part One and a biographical index to Part Two. The latter is especially good in that it contains sentence identifications of the persons listed.

Unhappily there are some points at which the book is weak. Occasionally it slips into "pious" or "sermonic" language, such as the description of Luther (p. 70) as "a sinner, saved only by the blood of Christ." Here and there throughout the book are Germanisms: that little word "already" slips in needlessly; or German rather than English word order disturbs the reader; or German phrases such

as "took the word" (p. 113), meaningful and expressive in German, have not been rendered into an American or English idiom.

In addition, a few items presented as factual material are questionable. For example, to refer to the Brethren of the Common Life at Magdeburg as "Lollards" (p. 72) is highly debatable. Admitting that the term "Lollard" was sometimes used as a designation of reproach and even of heresy rather than as a precise designation of the movement known as Lollardy, it would be extremely difficult to establish any connection between the Magdeburg Nullbrüder and Lollardy.

To speak of the "Heavenly Prophets" without quotes (p. 124 and elsewhere) and without reference to the tract that produced the title is confusing. It would be more meaningful to put the phrase in quotes and then allude to Luther's treatise, "Against the Heavenly Prophets."

There are a few errors which can be corrected quite easily in subsequent printings. The word "unloosened" (p. 22) should no doubt be "unloosed." The expression "hedgehog of doctrine" (p. 120) just doesn't come through to this reader (could it mean "hodgepodge"?). A "mute question" (p. 126) should be a "moot question."

On the whole, this is a good and serviceable book. It will find many grateful readers, especially in college and seminary classrooms.

E. CLIFFORD NELSON

Prayers of the Reformers. Compiled by Clyde Manschreck. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. 183 pages. \$2.50.

Years ago, as I sat in the classroom of the sainted Professor Plato Ernest Shaw waiting for class to begin, one of his colleagues stuck his head through the door and asked, "Where would I find a collection of prayers of the great men of the church?" I don't remember the answer, but the question stuck. It is answered, and answered well as far as the men of the Reformation are concerned, by the present little volume.

The dynamism of Luther, the moral fervor of Calvin, the cautious concern of Melancthon, the rhythmic beauty of British Reformers—all these, and others, too, such as Bucer, can be found in the book, accom-

panied by an excellent little treatise on the meaning of prayer for the Reformers. Historically and even aesthetically this has value. Above all the value is personal, however, and the volume can be used equally well for private and for public prayer.

Someone has said, and I know who it is, that the most important confessional document of the church is its hymnal. Quite correct! But let us not forget the prayers in this connection.

J. KNUDSEN

The School of Faith. By Thomas F. Torrance. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. 295 pages. \$6.00.

The sub-title aptly describes this book: "An anthology of catechisms, translated and edited and with an introductory essay." It was published in honor of the 450th anniversary of the birth of Calvin and, freshly translated, the texts of ten Calvinistic catechisms are included. The two of greatest interest are the Geneva and Heidelberg catechisms. These texts require 290 pages while 136 pages are devoted to introduction. This introduction is excellently done, not only offering constructive criticisms of the form and method of the catechisms but clarifying and offering an apologetic for the Reformed theology they represent.

The value of the book lies in the scholarly treatment of the catechisms of his church by the author. Those interested in the history and content of Christian education since the Reformation, or in a simple exposition of Calvinistic theology, will find authentic resource materials between the covers of this book.

The author or editor is professor of Church Dogmatics at the University of Edinburgh and New College, Edinburgh. He is also one of the editors of *The Scottish Journal of Theology* and is the author of several volumes on theology, including *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

The New Shape of American Religion. By Martin E. Marty. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959. 175 pages. \$3.50.

People who know Dr. Marty through his lectures and editorial work will not be

surprised to have him contribute a book of discernment. Employing a wide range of bibliography, he adds his own incisive interpretation of psychological and social forces that shape our culture and threaten the Christian church. The book is dark and disturbing reading for anyone who has been heartened by the post-war statistical picture of the church. Fortunately, even at the end of Chapter I, the author sounds a note of hope. To this hour, the hour of testing, he believes the church brings four assets: First, there are forces of non-conformity, such as the sects, and discernible resistant elements in Protestantism, Judaism, and Catholicism. Second, there is a recovery of biblical theology and a renaissance of constructive theology, notable today in several religious traditions and confessions. Third, the ecumenical movement has brought Americans into close contact with men who are struggling and dying for the faith. Fourth, there is hope in the life of the local congregations where men and women are indeed seeking earnestly something other than "what the Gentiles seek."

In the next four chapters the author is both photographer and artist in a relentless examination of the faith of American religion. With Chapter VI, "Signposts to Theological Resources," he moves the reader into the arena of responsible action. Two chapters on the parish and a concluding chapter on "The Call for a Culture Ethic" complete the journey.

Against the tide of "religion in general" Dr. Marty pleads for a recovery of particularity without the resurrection of "arrogant absolutism." Against a benevolent universalism he sees no alternative for the Christian church but to declare boldly, "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we might be saved."

Every pastor should read this book thoughtfully and, if possible, should enlist selected laymen of his parish in a study of it. It could form the basic document for a parish's creative reexamination of its objectives and program.

This book frightens without paralyzing; it alerts society and the Christian church to the swirling clouds, but leaves a vision of the

skies of light. It describes the judgment that has come to hover over the church almost without our knowing, but does not usher us into a hopelessness which lets us off. The grace of God is still afoot, and man can rise up responsibly into a future yet unformed. Unlike many social scientists, Dr. Marty is both an analyst and a prophet.

ALVIN N. ROGNESS

Svensk Psalm under 1900-talet. By Allan Arvastson. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1959. 188 pages.

When the new *Lutheran Service Book and Hymnal* came from the presses recently, there were those who could not understand why this should have taken more than ten years. It is perhaps helpful, therefore, to learn that the Church of Sweden spent more than fifty years in preparing and adopting its new official hymnal of 1937 (in the Scandinavian countries a church hymnal is called *Psalm-bok*). And the efforts ending in the 1937 book embraced only the hymns; what corresponds to the service book portion of our new volume was not adopted in a revised form until 1942.

In this book, telling the story of the years of effort out of which the 1937 *Psalm-bok* grew, Allan Arvastson presents a vast amount of detail drawn from the minutes of various revision committees and the correspondence of many people directly and indirectly involved. The skillful use of these archival materials as well as the great amount of usable materials carefully preserved are both typical of Scandinavian scholarship and respect for historical sources. While much of the story is of little or no interest except for persons very familiar with Scandinavian language and culture, there is also much in this story which would be illuminating to those in our own land who are concerned not only that the church should have a practical and popular hymnal but one which upholds the highest standards of both Christian doctrine and aesthetic taste.

The effort to produce a new hymnal in Sweden was complicated by matters which are more or less unique to the Swedish situation—the fact that the new hymnal had to have the approval of the government and the

Riksdag; the fact that its predecessor, the Wallin *Psalm-bok* of 1819, had come to be regarded as a national cultural treasure almost in the same sense as the British think of the Book of Common Prayer, the King James version of the Bible, or Shakespeare; the distressing diversion between various points of view on religious matters both within the church and in the nation as a whole; and the fact that the Swedes thought and still think of their *Psalm-bok* just as much a book of individual devotion as a collection of songs to be sung. On the other hand, the conflict between the points of view which regard an official hymnal as primarily an expression of correct doctrine, or primarily a monument of a great religious and cultural heritage, or primarily an expression of contemporary religious attitudes, or primarily a book to please popular tastes and thus to serve so-called "practical" needs—these intertwined conflicts, which could only result even after fifty years in a book which was in many ways a compromise, will be recognized as very similar to those lying back of the varied reactions to our own new book.

The Church of Sweden, however, is certainly to be commended for permitting and encouraging such thorough and widespread discussion of the contents of its proposed *Psalm-bok*. In this way the widest variety of interests and talents had a chance to play some part in its formation. The discussion considered in a very thorough way the basic issue of what the nature of an official hymnal should be and was not based merely on superficial likes and dislikes, and in the end the majority were convinced that only a hymnal which was comprehensive, and therefore had to compromise with the ideals of many, could win acceptance.

It is instructive to note how all the great theologians and public leaders of the church considered the preparation of this hymnal a matter worthy of their serious attention; the story is studded with great names like those of Bishop J. A. Eklund, Archbishop Söderblom, Bishops Gottfrid, Einar Billing, and Gustaf Aulen, as well as many others.

Instructive also is the part which the secular press and even the Swedish Academy played in the process. Could we imagine

the daily newspapers and the leading poets and authors of our own land considering the contents of a new hymnal something within their concern?

For those who can read Swedish, this book can be of great help in clarifying the standards by which a church hymnal should be judged. Even without a knowledge of Swedish, the book will be found helpful for those seeking bibliographical information about Swedish *Psalmboks*, Swedish hymn writers, and Swedish hymns.

JOEL W. LUNDEEN

Magic and Religion. Their Psychological Nature, Origin, and Function. By George B. Vetter. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. 555 pages. \$6.00.

While this book purports to be a psychological study of religion, it turns out to be a long argument in behalf of a materialistic philosophy of religion. What makes the book tiresome besides its length is the constant muddle of psychology and philosophy. Certainly no theologian or philosopher would dispute the right of a psychologist to examine religion. But he would expect the psychologist to come up with psychological analyses of religious behavior, empirical descriptions. Such an analysis *qua* empirical science says nothing about the metaphysical status of the objects studied. Yet in this book Professor Vetter (New York University) is constantly slipping from psychological descriptions into philosophical judgments. He assumes that because he must study the psychological phenomena of religion that this is all that religion is.

This is his grand conclusion at the end of the book about all religions: "They are but behavior; human, all too human!" (522). That is not a statement in psychology; it is a philosophical statement. Throughout the book he argues that advocates of religion are wrong in believing in minds, spirits, or the

supernatural. It would therefore seem that he is urging a metaphysical materialism upon the reader. But no, experimental psychology has made metaphysics and epistemology meaningless, and philosophers are as hapless creatures as theologians, both victims of technological obsolescence. But to argue that religion and philosophy are put out of court by psychology is to make a statement *about* psychology—not *in* it. Now either this must be argued—or it must be merely asserted. Since one cannot argue metaphysics, then Professor Vetter's view must be an act of faith. But since his view rules out faith of any kind as pre-scientific, then he must argue his case. And so he does—giving psychological evidence for a metaphysical view, which is both poor science and poor philosophy.

There are other muddles in the book too. In what appears as a climactic chapter, "Ethics and Religion," the author tries to rescue ethics from slavery to religion, as he sees it, but does so at the price of confusing ethics with technology, making ethical norms a means of getting something done. This is quite naturally his result when he will have nothing to do with a philosophical ethics either—but what he ends up with is hardly ethics.

This book is a reminder that materialism and scientism are not museum pieces. Professor Vetter has many interesting things to say in this book, and many things which ought to be taken seriously by those more sympathetic to religion than he. But the major thesis of the book—that religion is merely human behavior, totally explained by psychology, and that what we need is more science to save mankind—is not convincing. This does not mean that some of his arguments do not need more rigorous analysis than this review could give—for example, his identification of religion with magic, which is denied by many scholars of religion, including many psychologists of religion.

WILLIAM H. K. NARUM

